NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DXXVII.

OCTOBER, 1900.

BRYAN OR McKINLEY?

THE PRESENT DUTY OF AMERICAN CITIZENS.

BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON, DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR THE VICE-PRESIDENCY; SENATOR B. R. TILLMAN; EDWARD M. SHEPARD; RICHARD CROKER; ERVING WINSLOW, SECRETARY OF THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE; CHARLES EMORY SMITH, POSTMASTER-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; SENATOR G. F. HOAR; SENATOR T. C. PLATT; SENATOR W. M. STEWART; ANDREW CARNEGIE, AND JAMES H. ECKELS, FORMERLY COMPTROLLER OF THE UNITED STATES CURRENCY.

I.

THE ISSUE OF THE CAMPAIGN.

In each of the Presidential contests which have occurred within the last half-century the result has hinged, in large measure, upon a single issue. The campaign of 1852 resulted in the almost unanimous election of Pierce upon the supposed settlement of the slavery question by the "compromise measures" of the preceding Congress. Four years later, the salient question was the power of Congress over slavery in the Territories. Upon this issue the Democrats succeeded by a slender margin in electing Buchanan to the Presidency. In the exciting contest of 1860, every phase of the slavery question was, for months, the subject

Copyright, 1900, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of heated discussion. In fact, that contest—intensified by the Dred Scott decision—was but the renewal of the struggle upon the burning question which had so evenly divided parties at the preceding Presidential election. The "vigorous prosecution of the war" was the slogan of the victors in the campaign four years later. And "Reconstruction," in its various phases, was the overshadowing issue upon which General Grant was triumphant in the two Presidential contests immediately succeeding the second election of Mr. Lincoln.

In 1876, "old things had passed away" and a new issue was to the forefront. "Reform" was the watchword of the Democracy. With this good word, with all that it implied, as the symbol of the paramount issue, the friends of Mr. Tilden waged an almost successful battle. The result, long in doubt, and finally reached by the decision of an extra-Constitutional tribunal, was adverse to the Democratic candidate by a single electoral vote.

In the three contests immediately succeeding the historic struggle last mentioned, the pivotal question in debate and the decisive one—affected in some degree by the personality of the candidates—was Tariff Reform. Special prominence was given to this issue by the passage of the "McKinley bill," and denunciation of high protection as "robbery" by the Democratic Convention of 1892. In the first contest between the now opposing candidates for the Presidency, the question of Tariff Reform was held in abeyance, and Silver became the one vital issue of the struggle.

It is by no means asserted that, in these political contests of the past, no questions were discussed other than those I have mentioned. On the contrary, the entire pathway of the history of parties is luminous with debate along all lines of political thought. In the early days of the Republic, and before party organizations had attained to anything approximating their present discipline and authority, the "Jeffersonian and Hamiltonian Theories of Government," "the Line of Demarcation between State and Federal Authority, "Internal Improvements," "the United States Bank," "the Resolutions of '98," "Strict Construction," "The Compromises of the Constitution," etc., were subjects of endless debate for months preceding every Presidential election.

The contention is that, while there were many questions of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minor importance, and much expenditure of oratory upon mere abstract questions of government, yet, in the main, a single question was the storm-centre of controversy, and was decisive.

History has but repeated itself in the contest for political supremacy upon us now. One living question is to the forefront. It is in very truth the pivotal issue of the campaign. Political platforms may ignore it, yet it will not down. It is in the thoughts of men. It is with us to stay until it shall have been determined by the American people—the final arbiters, from whose judgment there is no appeal.

"Imperialism" is a new word in American politics. It had no place in the platform or the political controversies of the past. There had been no forecast of its possible existence as an issue in this campaign. It is a new question. How did it originate? Why is it here?

Events have followed upon each other so rapidly that we seem to have forgotten the avowed purpose of the late war with Spain. Our solemn declaration, before "breaking the peace of the world" in behalf of Cuba, was: "The United States hereby disclaims any disposition to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

This disclaimer alone justified the declaration of war to our own conscience. It was believed by the American people to be a war waged solely in the interest of humanity, and in no sense for commercial or territorial gain. An eminent Republican Senator, while the joint resolution was pending, voiced the sentiments of his countrymen when he declared: "It is a war in which there does not enter the slightest thought or desire of foreign conquest or of material gain or advantage." No one doubted at the time that this disclaimer upon our part applied not only to Cuba, but to all Spanish dependencies.

The "pacification" of the Island of Cuba—the avowed purpose of the war—has been achieved. Spain has sustained crushing and retributive defeat, and her flag, the hated emblem of tyranny to Cuban and Filipino alike, has disappeared forever from our hemisphere. Spain is at peace, well rid of colonial possessions that had been for centuries an obstacle to her material progress. But our Government is still engaged in war; not with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our ancient foe, but against our former allies in the war with Spain. It has been prosecuted at a fearful cost of treasure and of blood; little less than two hundred millions in money and many thousand valuable lives. Sixty thousand American soldiers are now in the Philippine Islands—and the end is not yet.

What is the justification for all this? Is it a war of self-defense, a war in the interest of humanity, or does it but add another to the long list of wars of subjugation and of conquest? These questions must give us pause. It is not strange that one whose love of liberty is inherited should have declared: "Uneasy consciences are multiplying in the Republican party."

When the ten million people of these twelve hundred islands are to abandon all hope of independence; when they are to lay down their arms and become our peaceable subjects; when the drain upon our blood and treasure is to cease—are questions no man is wise enough to answer. But granted that such, in the near or the remote future, is to be the termination of the struggle, what then? How are these people to be held and governed? What is to be their status? Are they to be citizens or subjects? If, as is claimed, they are incapable of self-government, are they to be vested by us with the dignity and the privileges of American citizenship, and entitled to representation in our National Legislature and in the Electoral College? No sane man can believe it. The only alternative, then, is government by force, by the power of the army and of the navy.

It need hardly be said that such government is wholly without Constitutional authority. Ours is a government of citizens, not of subjects. It is a government of limited powers, and its founders made no provision for holding "conquered provinces" or "alien peoples." The government of this far-away people, then, can only be by methods outside of the Constitution. In other words, there must be engrafted upon our body politic European methods of colonial government—a government that, in spirit, if not in form, pertains to the Empire and not to the Republic.

The justification for all this by Imperialists is that we can give these islanders a better government than they are capable of creating for themselves. What, then, becomes of the doctrine, so dear to our fathers, that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed?" What of the words of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lincoln: "No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent; when he governs himself and also governs another man, then that is more than self-government—that is despotism."

It is claimed that we have outgrown the doctrines of the founders of the Government, and that we are henceforth to be "a World Power." This is, indeed, a high-sounding phrase, but it is well to know its real meaning. As a model to the builders of republics—and an inspiration to all peoples who desire a larger measure of freedom—our Republic has, from its beginning, been "a World Power." But in the sense used by Imperialists, the term is one of terrible significance. To become a World Power is "to break with the past;" to abandon the traditions and disregard the warnings of the patriots and the sages of the Revolution. It implies, of necessity, the equipments of the World Powers of Europe. It means an immense standing army, with its continuing and ever increasing burdens of taxation. The picture is not pleasing, but at no less cost can we hold place as "a World Power."

Our colonial possessions will, of necessity, be governed by methods that are despotic. The lessons of history are full of warnings. Creasy, the historian, in his "Decisive Battles of the World," says: "There has never been a republic yet in history that acquired dominion over another nation that did not rule it selfishly and oppressively. There is no single exception to this rule, either in ancient or modern times. Carthage, Rome, Venice, Genoa, Florence, Holland and republican France, all tyrannized over every province and subject state where they gained authority."

In the event of the defeat which is inevitable to the islanders, in their conflict with the great Power, what is to be our compensation for the fearful sacrifice of life and of treasure? "Commercial gain." To whom? Surely not to "the plain people." It is only theirs to bear the additional taxation the new policy imposes. It can only be to "the syndicated wealth" described in a recent letter of an eminent statesman of New England. Trade —"the calm health of nations"—is profitable only with peoples with whom we are at peace. Trade knows no sentiment. It goes only where it is profitable. Ninety per cent. of our exports reach European markets, for "only the civilized man is the con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sumer." Is commercial gain the low plane upon which we stand? Is this our justification for abandoning the pathway marked out by the fathers, and along which we have found contentment and safety? Commercial gain to a class as the end of a war of conquest! Are there no higher motives to which appeal can be made? The words of Patrick Henry to the Virginia Convention may be recalled: "You are not to consider how your trade is to be increased, but how justice may be done, and how your liberties may be preserved."

The lust of empire is the plague that has come upon us in these closing hours of the century. Against it we are warned by the wrecks that lie along the entire pathway of history.

The new policy of Imperialism finds its inspiration in "corporate greed." This influence is potent as never before, in all the channels of authority. It has touched the springs of political power. Against it are the warnings of those whom we have been accustomed to revere. No statesman of the last generation discerned more clearly its appalling danger to republican government than did Mr. Lincoln. It is well now, when the attempt is made to enthrone commercial gain as the supreme good, to recall his prophetic words. In a letter written in 1864, he said: "But I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands, and the Republic is destroyed."

Authoritative declaration should be made at once to the people of the Philippine Islands that it is not our purpose to conquer or to subjugate them. Under existing conditions, they should be protected against the cupidity and aggression of foreign nations. All this, upon our part, to the end that the Filipinos may have the full enjoyment of liberty, and stable government fashioned by their own hands.

In view of all that has occurred, and of what must inevitably follow, in the event of the Republican Administration receiving a "vote of confidence" at the polls, are not Democrats justified in declaring Imperialism the paramount issue of the campaign? Other questions will be discussed. In terse words, the Demo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic platform calls attention to the enormous growth of the Trust evil, and justly characterizes it as a menace to our free institutions. The Hay-Pauncefote treaty is condemned, as a surrender of rights not to be tolerated by the American people. But, in the presence of the overshadowing issue, even these are questions of secondary importance. Imperialism is the paramount issue. Around this, the battle will be most fiercely waged. Is it too much to say that its determination will be for the weal or the woe of the Republic?

ADLAI E. STEVENSON.

II.

CAUSES OF SOUTHERN OPPOSITION TO IMPERIALISM.

IN a few brief weeks, one of the grandest spectacles in the history of the world will take place. Fifteen million American freemen will march to the polls and record their choice for President. The Chief Magistrate of a great nation, one of the wealthiest and most powerful nations of the earth, will be chosen by the ballots of the individual citizens.

The stupendous power vested in the President of the United States is second only to that of the Czar of Russia, and the amount of patronage at his disposal is far greater than that of any potentate on earth. The President is in effect a King—uncrowned, it is true, but with far greater power than most kings are allowed to exercise. It is small wonder, then, that a Presidential election convulses our country from one end to the other; and that, as a Presidential election approaches, men of all classes cease to give attention to other matters, and the one all-absorbing topic of conversation and thought is this election. The struggle for the mastery between the great parties, and the policies and principles they represent, dwarfs every other interest, and political activity permeates the entire country. The crowded city and the rural hamlet are alike moved. The issues involved are so important, and the interests at stake are so great, that nothing else is thought of and talked about. The newspapers teem with editorials presenting the claims of the opposing candidates. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mails are flooded with literature intended to educate the voters and rouse them to enthusiasm. Thousands of speakers, by day and by night, urge the claims of the parties they represent, and beg votes for the candidates of their choice. We are in the midst of such a convulsion now, and at no time in the past has there been more feeling and more intense interest.

The approaching election, in far-reaching consequences, overshadows any similar event in our history since the momentous canvass of 1860. The citizens of our great Republic are face to face with a crisis that does not come twice in the life of a generation. Indeed, the questions at issue in the present Presidential campaign are so momentous that the future historian may declare they outweigh those which convulsed the country at the outbreak of the Civil War. Then the issue was whether slavery should be extended into the Territories, and the country remain half slave and half free. Now, the paramount issue, as proclaimed in the Democratic platform and as admitted by President McKinley's letter of acceptance, is whether the country shall remain a republic in fact and in name, or whether our government shall undergo a change, and an Empire, resting on force and military power, shall take its place. That party which sneers at and tramples under foot the doctrine of the consent of the governed in the Philippines will soon sneer at that doctrine in the United States. Tyranny never advances openly and boldly to its goal. It approaches by indirection, and ever makes the fairest professions and promises.

There are other questions presented to the people for consideration, and they will, no doubt, have some weight in influencing votes; but they all dwindle into insignificance and can only claim a passing thought, while the great question of Republic or Empire fires the imagination and excites the eloquence of every man who writes or speaks on the subject. The questions of the currency and banks, gold and silver, of the income tax, and government by injunction, of trusts and how to check and control them—none of these can be discussed with any satisfaction, because the people, as a whole, are not interested in them, and these questions will cut a small figure in determining the result. And it is small wonder that this is the case. Republican orators may appeal for the maintenance of the "national honor," and they may urge upon the voters the claims of the party which,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they say, has given the working-man the "full dinner pail." They may urge upon the people the necessity of guarding against the "fifty cents silver dollar;" but the thoughtful, intelligent American cannot escape from the nightmare which haunts his dreams—the vision of the Empire and of the large standing army which the Empire would involve. This question is ever before him, and he considers the others of little moment just now. He reasons that "the full dinner pail" may or may not be the result of McKinley's election four years ago. Common sense teaches that there was an inevitable reaction from the depressed condition of the country following the panic of 1893, that enforced economy, and the closing down of manufacturing plants reduced the stock of goods, thus stimulating a demand, and under these influences, accompanied by the failure of the European wheat crop and the increase of the gold output, there was an inevitable revival of business and consequently re-employment for the idle workmen. The prosperity of the last four years is by no means general, even in the United States, and Republican policies following McKinley's election cannot have affected the prosperity of Europe, which has enjoyed a similar revival of business. Therefore the thoughtful working man will carefully consider whether or not he owes McKinley a vote this year, even if he is fortunate enough not to be idle and to have plenty to eat.

Then, along with the question of the "full dinner pail," will arise the suggestion of doubt as to whether there will not be a return of hard times, even though McKinley is elected. This thought will continue to haunt him: "What good will the 'full dinner pail' do me and my children, even though it should remain full for all future time—and I know that cannot be—if, by my vote, I assist in overthrowing the Republic which our fathers founded, and I become a party to the repeal and repudiation of the Declaration of Independence?" Of what use is a "full dinner pail" to the American who is no longer a freeman? Of what stuff is the American made who sells his birthright for a "full dinner pail"? This thought must come to every intelligent man who listens to the frantic pleas and arguments of the Republican orators.

Let us consider briefly whether the claim of the Democratic party, that the present election will settle the question whether or not we are to remain a Republic or become an Empire, is true.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The action of Congress in regard to Porto Rico leaves no doubt as to the purpose of the Republican party or its future policy, if again entrusted with power. It was avowed, in the debates in the House and Senate, that the reason Porto Rico was not given a territorial government similar to that of Arizona or New Mexico was that to give it such a government would be setting a precedent, entailing the necessity of treating the Philippines in the same way; and this the Republican leaders considered sufficient reason for refusing to do our "plain duty," as set forth in President McKinley's message. It is not contended by any Republican leader that there is any purpose to do more than govern the Philippines, after they have been subjugated, in accordance with the absolute will of Congress. They declare that the Constitution does not follow the flag, and the time-honored doctrine, aye, the sacred doctrine, that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," is sneered at as an academic proposition, and any and every kind of argument is brought forward to show that it is puerile and has never had any binding force. The latest illustration, and one that is likely to become popular with Republican orators, is afforded by the Southern States, and the Republican speakers are even now ringing the changes on the inconsistency and absurdity of Southern white men proclaiming their belief in the doctrine that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," while they deny the negroes of the South any place in governmental affairs. I will treat this subject more at length presently; but just now I want to put this question to my readers: Can the American Republic remain a republic, except in name, when the bed-rock upon which it rests is taken from beneath it? Can we, as a people, maintain our institutions in their full vigor, and enjoy the blessings which we have inherited from our fathers, when we wantonly destroy and cast away as rubbish the great charter of our liberties? Rome remained a republic in form a century after it had ceased to be a republic in fact, and the lessons of all history teach us that, if, under the starry banner of our country, a despotism is established in the Philippines and in Porto Rico, we will ere long see the establishment of a despotism in the United States. The Republic, to paraphrase Lincoln's words, cannot remain half subject and half free.

Now, in regard to the alleged "hypocrisy" of Southern Demo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crats—that hypocrisy which gives such unction to Republican orators—I would call attention to certain facts. The disfranchisement of the ignorant Southern negroes in some of the States within Constitutional limits, does not in any way involve or destroy the truth of the declaration that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Jefferson, who penned those immortal words, was himself a slaveholder, and the Constitution which our fathers gave us recognized slavery, yet the apparent inconsistency with which Jefferson might be charged, and with which the founders of the Constitution might be charged, did not prevent the idea from becoming a religion to the people who enjoy the blessing of living under this Republic. The only legitimate and honest interpretation of the words is that in any Commonwealth the power to govern must emanate from within, and be by consent of the people governed. It was in contradiction of the doctrine of the divine right of Kings or of force from without, and any other form of government would be despotic. Hence, our use of the term "Imperialism," which Jefferson and Lincoln would indorse if alive.

The mysterious influence of race antagonism and caste feeling cannot be discussed here. It has always existed; it is ineradicable; and it will continue as a governing factor wherever the races come into contact. The condition in the South, instead of offering an argument against the claim of the Democratic party that the Republic is in danger, and that we are threatened with Empire if Republican policies prevail, offers the very strongest object lesson, going to prove the truth of that contention. There are about nine million blacks in this country; and the race riots in New York City, and the bloody tragedy in Akron, Ohio, should silence for all time any charges against the Southern whites of being more cruel in their treatment of the negro than Northern men are. The difference between the treatment of negroes by Southern mobs and the treatment of the negroes in the North is that Northern white men vent their anger upon the blacks indiscriminately, and that their race hatred is so intense that the innocent and unoffending are made to suffer. In the South, on the other hand, the mob hunts down the man who is guilty or supposed to be guilty, and innocent negroes are not molested. The Anglo-Saxon is pretty much the same wherever you find him, and he walks on the necks of every colored race he comes into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contact with. Resistance to his will or interests means destruction to the weaker race. Confronted, as we are, within our own borders with this perplexing problem, why do we seek to incorporate nine millions more of brown men under the flag? Republican leaders do not longer dare to call into question the justice and the necessity of limiting the negro suffrage in the South. They only propose selfishly to take advantage of the provision of the Fourteenth Amendment, which gives Congress the right to cut down representation in the Electoral College of any State which has denied suffrage to any of its citizens. The negro is to be sacrificed, provided the South shall thereby be stripped of political power. The Republican party is anxious to see this purpose consummated.

With what right, then, can the party of Lincoln, or the party which has claimed to stand for all of Lincoln's ideals and aspirations, twit Southern men with inconsistency and insincerity? We have inherited our race problem and the question is not one that can be thrust aside voluntarily. "The White Man's Burden" is upon us, and, like Sindbad's Old Man of the Sea, will be upon us for all time. Is that any reason why we should lose our liberties at home and become a part of an Empire, holding in subjugation nine millions of Malays, with the probability and almost certainty of further expansion if Republican policies prevail, and of having ere long fifty or a hundred million Chinese in addition? Was Lincoln a dreamer when he said that "the Republic cannot endure half slave and half free?" Because the Southern whites have felt constrained to deprive some of the negroes of a share in the Government, thus denying to them the recognition embodied in the declaration that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," is that any reason why this great Republic should seek to subjugate more men of the colored race, and deny them that great blessing?

Those who criticise the Southern white people in their dealings with the suffrage question may well be asked: "Has not the Republican party silently acquiesced in all that has been done in recent years in this matter? Who has heard any protest from Mr. McKinley or his advisers?

If the South has applied drastic remedies to a deadly disease, which it inherited, it cannot be said that any one of her citizens has advocated or indorsed the maintenance of slavery anywhere

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

within the jurisdiction of the United States, as Mr. McKinley has done in his Sulu agreement.

We of the South have never acknowledged that the negroes were our equals, or that they were fitted for or entitled to participate in government; therefore, we are not inconsistent or hypocritical when we protest against the subjugation of the Filipinos, and the establishment of a military government over them by force. Conscious of the wrongs which exist in the South, and seeking anxiously for a just and fair solution of the Race Question, we strenuously oppose incorporating any more colored men into the body politic. We dread the reflex action, the example, the familiarizing of our people with despotic methods. We do not want to add to the perplexities involved in the Race Question in the South the greater danger involved in the conquest and government of the Philippine Islands, outside of and contrary to the Constitution. All other issues are dwarfed, therefore, by this issue, in our minds. The South to-day affords the purest and best type of American citizenship. What I mean is that the people who inhabit the States south of the Potomac and Ohio rivers are the descendants of men who founded the Government. They are "native and to the manner born," to the second, third and fourth generation. They are lacking in some of the elements of progressiveness which characterize Northern communities, but they possess civic virtues which were the boast and glory of the American citizen of fifty years ago, in a much larger proportion than exists in any other section of the country. And in the future, if not in the coming election, the people of that section will be the conservative force which will preserve our institutions —if they are to be preserved. We are nearly all Americans and cling to American traditions. We have the genuine, original seed-corn of liberty.

The Republican party cannot, with any degree of self-respect or decency, ask the American people for leave to subjugate the Filipinos for the purpose of governing them as Southern negroes are governed. This cannot be done, in the first place, because the conditions are different. In the South, the races are commingled in every community, and material for intelligent, honest officials exists everywhere. Nothing of the kind can be found in the Philippines. In the second place, the Republican party will belie all its boasted past if it is allowed to consummate its scheme of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conquest and to set up a military despotism in the East. Mr. Hoar protests that the Republican party is the party of liberty and can be trusted, and he does this in the face of the President's declaration that the Filipinos will be given only such share in the government as we consider them "capable of exercising." How can Mr. Hoar defend the abandonment of the negroes by the Republican party at home, and defend the President's policy of subjugating the Filipinos with a view to governing them with greater hardships than Southern negroes have ever had to endure? Mr. Hoar is opposed to conquering and retaining the Philippines, but Mr. Hoar supports Mr. McKinley, and Mr. McKinley is committed to that policy irrevocably; and no Republican leader, not even Governor Roosevelt, will now dare to wave the bloody shirt and preach a crusade against the South's treatment of the negro. The North has a bloody shirt of its own. Many thousands of them have been made into shrouds for murdered Filipinos, done to death because they were fighting for liberty. There is no parallel in history for such a somersault. The two parties have swapped places since 1860. The Democratic party now stands for liberty and true American principles. It still believes in the Declaration as written and understood by the author and his compatriots of 1776. The Republicans repudiate the Declaration and are as besotted in pursuing the scheme of conquest and robbery in the East, as the slave oligarchy of 1860 was in supporting the institution of human slavery in the South. The people are thinking as they have never thought before, and every patriot awaits with bated breath the verdict which will be rendered in November.

B. R. TILLMAN.

III.

SUPPORT OF MR. BRYAN BY SOUND-MONEY DEMOCRATS.

THE greater number—I believe much the greater number—of citizens who before 1896 had acted with the Democratic party, but in that year opposed its Presidential candidate, will this year support him. They will do this, though he has not recanted his silver heresy, and though now, no less than in 1896, they condemn his error. Their course in 1900 is not only right in itself—and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that is the principal thing—but it consists with the whole frame of their political belief. Any other course would be inconsistent with that belief, and with the principle which determined their vote in 1896.

The Indianapolis platform upon which in that year some of the Sound-Money Democrats nominated Senator Palmer was a fine declaration of faith in democratic self-government. It demanded a gold standard of value. But to those who wrote or supported that platform, and to the far greater number who believed in it, the gold standard was no more than one practical result or illustration of a creed broader and deeper than any rule of coinage. They did not make of it a political deity; that would have been no better than its personification as a tyrant. The gold standard was for the time critically important; but it was important, nevertheless, as a detail or result, not as a principle. Its temporary rank in the politics of 1896 was due to a condition then, but not now, existing. Although modern business had then moved steadily and irresistibly towards the gold standard, and although modern industrial welfare clearly required it, nevertheless it was not yet clearly founded in our legislation, but was the subject of immediate and practical political difference, made acute by the fall in the price of silver. During the four years since 1896, financial changes the world over have, even more firmly and more plainly, established the gold standard; it has been adopted in American statute; and political opposition to it in the United States has died away into subordinate and tepid statements which are no longer practical, but are, though never so sincere, made chiefly out of regard for the jewel of consistency so much preached and so often forgotten by statesmen. The Gold Democrats were, in 1896, neither more nor less than men of generally Democratic faith dealing with a specific and temporary question, upon the basis of their general hostility to interference with economic laws by governmental fiat. In 1900 they remain Democrats, having little practical call to deal with that question, but having every call to deal with one vastly larger and deeper. In 1900, they are concerned, not with a detail or illustration of the principles enunciated at Indianapolis in 1896, but with their very foundation. Shall this people reverse their supreme rule of government with the consent of the governed, that rule in assertion of which they have, during a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

century and a third, struggled to a greater and greater result of world-reforming beneficence and domestic prosperity? Shall we substitute military and Mohammedan ideals for those of industrial righteousness and peace, which we have thus far kept steadfastly before our eyes—sweeping away one by one obstructions and exceptions which have tormented or disgraced our nation, and from decade to decade more and more nearly reaching full realization? Sound Money Democrats, if their faith in self-government remain—and without that faith they were never Democrats—are bound in 1900 to vote with a regard to the Philippine policy of the President as controlling as was their regard in 1896 to the fallacious and dangerous silver proposal.

Is not this clear? Sound Money Democrats in 1896 did not abate hostility to the system of special privilege for small and rich interest, the greater wealth of a few at the cost of the many, for which the Republican party then stood and now stands. Nor did they permanently abandon their own party because it had once and lamentably adopted, and then defended, an economic illusion which the Republican party had adopted, and which in itself was not as widely or permanently corrupting as the Republicans' belief in a paternal government. Indeed, every political party, at one time or another, preaches some illusion, economic or social; probably no great political party is ever free from such illusion. Hardly a political platform can be quoted which has on every article commanded the support of the majority of a great party, or escaped the condemnation of an important minority. When questions of slavery were uppermost, very many Democrats acted with the Republican party, although hostile to a protective tariff and to much else for which the majority of the Republican party seemed to stand. Precisely the same happened in 1896, when free coinage was uppermost. Surely illusion about coinage was in itself no worse than illusion about protective tariffs, nor as bad. The illusions were equally venerable and lamentable, but the corruption of the latter far deeper and wider and more difficult of treatment. The silver illusion had before 1896 found its most dangerous support among Republicans and its most resolute opposition among Democrats. During the concern of our politics with the money question for twenty years before 1896, President McKinley had dedicated his gift of pleasing eloquence to the cause of free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that cause then seemed to be popular. From President Cleveland's entrance into national politics in 1884 until he last left the Presidency, he dedicated his gift of resolute and courageous honesty to the cause of sound money; that cause then seemed to be unpopular. Each of the statesmen found much support and much opposition within his own party. It is only ten years ago that a Republican President and Congress (Mr. McKinley voting for the bill) enacted the Sherman Silver Law—the most dangerous of the victories of the free silver forces. The same administration admitted to the Union territories which, though their populations were then meagre for statehood, were at least ready to contribute to the Senate several and perhaps decisive votes for free silver.

In 1896, the business depression created exceptional temptation to political vagary. The Republican administration of 1889-1893 not only surrendered to silver, but increased the "protective" advantage to favored interests beyond the extremest point of former Republican legislation, and enormously increased pensions for a war which had ended almost thirty years before. No doubt in 1893 other conditions of business distress had long been gathering; but these acts of national improvidence and unwisdom helped to prepare for that year its widespread financial disaster and industrial distress. To others belonged the causes; but President Cleveland had to meet the result, and he did meet it as befitted leadership of a democracy. He used no smooth words; he did not pretend that laws could take the place of harvests, or industry or thrift. He offered no nostrum or panacea. Instead, he applied all the powers which, for a few months, are the property of a newly inaugurated President, to something really within the power of law makers—a reversal of the free silver victory accomplished by Messrs. Allison and McKinley and their associates. It was a fine display of civic courage and unselfish skill, and like that of the earlier Democratic President who, in 1837, in spite of the outcry of business distress, refused to add new folly to follies which had already produced the distress, and instead drove through the Sub-Treasury a bill which brought to an end—at least for a time—the corrupting partnership between the government and the banks. The fundamental proposition of both Presidents was, that all the people should support the government rather than that the government should support some of the people at the cost

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the rest. But *post hoc propter hoc* is the easiest, as it is the shallowest, of reasoning in politics. If business depression followed President Cleveland's inauguration, did he not, therefore, produce it? The last thing which had happened was sufficient for careless or untrained minds, whether of Democrats or Republicans. The real cause, however, was something further back and more truly dynamic than a change of Presidents. If for nothing else, the Republican party deserves defeat for the shallow demagogy with which in 1900 it refers the business distresses of 1893-1896 to the slight reductions of tariff made by the Wilson bill, and to the incoming of President Cleveland. For this proposition the Philadelphia Convention and its chief supporters have declared that every vote for President McKinley shall be counted. It was wrong for Republicans to ascribe hard times to trifling tariff reductions, which were made a year after the hard times began, and the business effect of which had hardly begun when the hard times ended. So it was wrong, but no more wrong, for the Democratic Convention of 1896 to ascribe hard times to the sound money policy in which President Cleveland had been steadfast, whether when, during his first term, he prevented legislation such as his Republican successor approved, or when, in his second term, he procured the repeal of that legislation. There was, in truth, less folly in the belief that the sound money policy had produced hard times, than in the belief that Democratic tariff reductions had produced them. For it needs no Adam Smith to perceive that hard times must have been caused by a serious and long continuing cause; and the sound money policy was—as the Wilson tariff bill clearly was not—a serious and long continuing cause, which had doubtless produced economic results real, though different from, and more wholesome than, those ascribed to it by the silver advocates. If Republicans do not desert Mr. McKinley and their party for his and its long coquetry with silver, and for their immoral and shallow charge of hard times upon the Cleveland administration and the Wilson bill, surely Democrats need not feel bound, after the silver issue is practically past, to desert their party because of their candidate's devotion to the same policy, and the declaration of the Chicago Convention of 1896 that hard times had been due to the success of the sound money cause.

In 1896, Republicans demanded more protection to favored

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and special interests as the true cure for hard times; and a majority of Democrats as their cure demanded free silver coinage at the old ratio. With the Republican party controlled by this chronic belief in making men rich by legislation, and with another form of the same belief in temporary control of the Democratic organization, the Sound Money Democrats had to determine their duty. They could not then support Mr. Bryan without stultification. He had, with a courageous frankness which shone in comparison with the neutral platitudes about money and the glorification of protection by the statesman of Canton, declared free coinage to be the first issue. The people, ignoring all other issues, declared it to be the all-paramount and present issue. The Sound Money Democrats came out of the campaign of 1896 with no spoils of office, but with the entire moral victory. For they had not, like President McKinley and his party, opposed Mr. Bryan with vague and insincere promises of bi-metallism. They *meant* gold and they *said* gold. To them, whether those who voted for Senator Palmer, or those who, not daring "of two evils to choose neither," voted for President McKinley, more than to any equal body of citizens, was due the character, the emphasis and the final decisiveness of the result.

The Democratic party remains. Like the Republican party and all other parties, it has, from time to time, made its mistakes and had its vagaries. But they are less deeply seated in its essential philosophy, and, therefore, less chronic, than those of the Republican party. And surely if, four years ago, good citizens adhered to the latter when they believed it to be right on a present and paramount issue, they need not scruple to adhere to the Democratic party when in 1900 it is right on that other and greater issue, which for 1900 has become present and paramount.

The American people are to-day little concerned with what the Republican administration has done willingly about the tariff, or has done unwillingly about the currency. They are seriously concerned with its policy in the Philippines and Porto Rico. They may praise, or they may condemn. But whether they praise or condemn, their concern is deep and vital. Some admire the President's policy as an inspiring departure from a career hitherto "parochial," or piously see in it a surrender to God's own leading. Others condemn it as a betrayal of democracy. But all alike, including both candidates, recognize that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy as the chief and controlling feature of his administration. If the sound political rule for a country governed, like ours, by two great parties, is to be followed, the campaign should turn on that policy. If the programme invented and carried on by the President or by those who act through him, be right, then he should be re-elected that he may carry it to a conclusion. If it be wrong, then he should be defeated, and a President should be chosen who will reverse that policy. This would and should be the rule, if the question were no more important than the tariff or silver coinage or the Isthmian canal. The rule is rigorously imperative when the question concerns the fundamental proposition of American government and civilization.

Is such a question, then, practically presented? It is President McKinley's expressly declared policy to complete the military conquest of the Philippines, and thereafter, and for such time as we think fit, to hold in military subjugation the eight million Filipinos. For this purpose the President maintains and, if re-elected, he will continue to maintain, an army of 75,000 men, in addition to those otherwise needed. For this purpose he has inflicted and, if re-elected, he will continue to inflict, death, disease and desolation upon thousands of Americans and tens of thousands of Filipinos. For this purpose he compels the peaceful labor of his countrymen to contribute annually not less than $100,000,000, with a return in profit to a score of American traders of less than two per cent. of this cost. Here is the practical side of the question; and it is sufficiently serious. But it is the lesser part of the issue. Dollars and lives, no doubt, may be justly spent for a great cause of humanity. The President proposes (nor can his fair phrases or audacious references to Abraham Lincoln, without daring to quote him, conceal his intention, or that of the strong men behind him), as the result of our final military success in the Orient, that the American people shall adopt the policy of holding alien and distant races in permanent and military subjection, without share in their own government except as the American people choose to accord it, and also without share, as matter of right, in the American Constitution. We now call this policy Imperialism. The name is not of moment; but it fits the thing. Disraeli chose the title "Empress" for the Queen when exercising that arbitrary dominion of Great Britain over India which we are to emulate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is for this Imperialism that the dollars are to be spent and the death, disease and desolation to be inflicted, and all the long hatreds and corruptions of war to be incurred. Nor is it a new topic for Americans. Again and again and again, from the outcry against the Stamp Act in 1766 to the adoption, more than a century later, of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, has the whole scheme been deliberately considered and condemned by the American people. In that condemnation, we have found our supreme and characteristic political glory. Every solemn, responsible and undiscredited declaration of our statesmen, all the teaching of our town meetings, our churches and our schools have joined in the condemnation. If our practice have not equalled our preaching—if in the treatment of Indians or of Negroes within our borders our principle has been violated,—we have not, therefore, denied the principle, but have profoundly regretted that calamitous and inconsistent exceptions should have been imposed upon us by the presence of these inferior races in the midst of our population before the Declaration of Independence. These we have declared an evil to be escaped or ended where practicable, never a good to be preserved and extended. We have opposed and dreaded the addition of any like difficulty. Never before—unless in Ostend manifestoes rejected by the people with disgust—**has it been proposed that our Republic should** conquer another land or another race, or acquire any land or people unless to dower them with the civil rights of Americans. One by one, and sometimes at cruel cost, we have reduced the exceptions within our domain to the universality of the American principle. We have, until now, moved steadily nearer and nearer—though God knows we may still be distant—to the ideal of that Declaration, which extorts from even President McKinley a formal and reluctant reverence. The issue, therefore, is not only of blood and treasure and Imperialism, but of reversal of what we have made the fundamental proposition of our New World civilization. And more. There is in the issue this, whether we shall reverse this proposition at the very time when its fruits are more splendid than ever before, and its success, moral and material, are known of all men to be vastly greater than any achieved by empire. Out of the buoyancy, energy, courage which are born of that orderly liberty, in which every one is jealous of the rights of others, as involving for the future the safeguard of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his own rights, has come the marvellous productiveness of American labor. The wealth of the rich, never before so great, the order and safety of life and property, never so great throughout so extended a field, the well-being of labor, the wonderful reach and growth of all these in our land are due, so far as human effort or wisdom has produced them, to our translation into politics of the sacred rule of Christianity—to our supreme dedication to the doctrine that, in their rights as citizens, all men are created free and equal, and that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth."

President McKinley and his supporters will not and dare not directly argue the question. They evade its merits by collateral and subordinate objections, criticisms, defenses. But it will not down. They threaten a panic, as if their Secretary of the Treasury before campaign necessities constrained him, and Mr. Russell Sage, who, perhaps, of all Mr. McKinley's supporters, may be deemed most expert in panics, have not pointed out that there can be none, as if the threat were not a silly imputation upon nearly if not quite one-half of the American people. They tell us that Mr. Bryan, if President, would set up the silver standard, as if the gold law, according to the Republican platform itself, did not make this impossible without violation of his oath of office, or as if he had not made clear that he is no perjurer, but courageous, honest, law-abiding. They tell us the gold law itself will be in danger, when they know that neither a Senate nor a House can be found during the next Presidency to pass a free-coinage bill, and that a large, and perhaps the larger, part of the Democratic party are to-day hostile to free coinage. President McKinley cynically points out that, in the suppression of the negro vote, the South is doing what he is trying to do in the Philippines, as if that were a reason *for,* rather than a telling reason *against,* his course; or as if the enormous difficulties inflicted upon us by the crime committed centuries ago against the negro race ought to be matched by like difficulties assumed in Asia; or as if wise Southerners, like wise Northerners, do not hate the new departure, because it will bring upon us more of the inconsistency-breeding difficulties from which the South suffers. They point out the Chicago heresies of four years ago and their nominal re-adoption at Kansas City, as if there were no paramount issue overshadowing them all, or as if citizens voting for a can-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

didate must vote for the entire platform, or as if they did not know that President McKinley himself can be elected only by inducing a sufficient number of his countrymen to forget assertions in the Philadelphia platform which are to them false and unrighteous. They give us garbled accounts of how the President got into his difficulties, as if the question were how we came to the Philippines, rather than what we have done and shall do with them and their people. They tell us that England has had both liberty and Imperialism, as if the American Declaration and the American Constitution or their splendid fruits belonged to her, or as if her prosperity and glory had arisen from her arbitrary extensions of power by the sword rather than from her vigorous extirpation of everything imperial at home, and from her self-governing and non-imperial colonies across the seas.

I cannot here argue these or other objections. Not one touches or begins to touch the question, whether or not, on the Asiatic coast, eight thousand miles from our nearest shores, the Republic shall pursue a career of conquest of foreign peoples, to hold them, not as citizens or with rights under our Constitution, but as subjects. Nor does President McKinley dare to argue or even explicitly to mention the question. To promote the wrong of it naturally assemble all who believe that might makes right, that the stronger should crowd the weaker, and that, as Senator Hanna argued, the American should find his sole creed and his sole glory in his "dinner pail."

It is a true battle for the dignity of American manhood and for the everlasting rights of the masses of men. Surely, no Democrat ought to doubt on which side he will stand.

EDWARD M. SHEPARD.

IV.

THE INTEREST OF THE FIRST VOTER.

VICTORY in November, 1900, will be won by the party which appeals most successfully to the new voters, the citizens who have come of age since the Presidential election of 1896. His first national ballot is a matter vastly more important to a young man than a vote is to a veteran. The arguments usually addressed to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men who are in the habit of voting the Democratic or the Republican Presidential ticket, are by no means the best for those who have never voted for a President, and who are making up their minds with which of the two great parties to ally themselves.

There are really only two national parties. It is not likely that there will ever be more than two, of commanding influence, at any one time.

With which of the two parties at present dividing the serious thought of the country can the First Voter ally himself, with the assurance of promoting his own good as well as that of his country? The idea that a young voter thinks of himself first, and then of his country, is, no doubt, shocking to purely theoretical politicians. Practical men, however, know it to be a fact. Facts are what the managers of national campaigns have to deal with, and the campaign manager who gets hold of the most facts and acts in accordance with them is the one who succeeds. The fight is won by the man behind the ballot. His leaders theorize, but he votes. The commanding officer in a battle may have his manual of tactics at his fingers' ends, but the fate of his cause is decided by the man behind the gun. All the books in the world cannot teach a greenhorn on the firing-line to shoot his rifle straight. The fine-spun theories of the scholar in politics are equally useless to the voter who approaches the polling-booth for the first time.

Thinking, then, of himself and of his own future, his business or his profession, his family and his friends, the average young American must make up his mind along which of the two party paths his best interests lie. By following that path, he will at the same time be best serving his country. It seems to me that there can be no sort of doubt that the welfare of the country, as a whole, is best promoted by that which is best for its young men. That disposes of the objection that the view I am advancing of political duty is a purely selfish one. The youth of the land are its life blood. How can they be most effectively and wholesomely stimulated and directed?

It is an inspiring topic, this appeal of the two great national parties to a million young men for the first time assuming the highest duty and privilege of citizenship.

Under which banner will American youth enlist in November,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1900? It is quite likely that the decision then made may determine the political affiliations of these young men, this magnificent army of American electors, for their lives. It is not unlikely, indeed, that it will also determine the political views of their brothers and sons, when they, in turn, reach the age of franchise. How vastly important it is, then, to the Democratic party that the young voters should this year cast Democratic ballots! If there are clear and convincing reasons why the Democracy offers young voters the greatest and surest opportunities, a public service, a service not only to the party but to the American people, can be rendered by a presentation of those reasons in a periodical like THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

The entire number of votes cast in November, 1884, was 10,044,985. Of these, 4,911,017 were polled for Grover Cleveland, and 4,848,334 for James G. Blaine. Of the ten million ballots, Cleveland had a plurality of only 62,683.

In four years, the Presidential vote of the American people had increased, in 1888, to 11,380,860, of which Grover Cleveland received 5,538,233 and Harrison 5,440,216, Cleveland still having 98,017 more votes at the polls, although Harrison had a majority in the Electoral College, and was, of course, elected President.

In November, 1892, the American people cast 12,059,351 votes, of which 5,556,918 were polled for Cleveland, and 5,176,108 for Harrison. Cleveland's plurality this time was 380,810.

By November, 1896, the votes of the people for President had increased to 13,923,102. Of these 7,104,779 were cast for William McKinley, and 6,502,925 for William Jennings Bryan.

Mr. McKinley's plurality, the first the Republican party had had in twelve years, was 601,854, being the largest plurality any Presidential candidate had had since 1872. In that year General Grant, the hero of the war, entrenched in power by four years' occupation of the White House, was elected President over Horace Greeley, the reformer, by a plurality of only 762,691 votes in the popular vote.

Now, the normal increase in the number of votes for President, reckoning from one four years to another, is more than ten per cent. Adding ten per cent. to the vote of 1892, would give us an estimated vote for 1896 of 13,265,286; whereas the actual vote in 1896 was 657,816 more than that. It is plain, then, that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unless the excess over the estimated ten per cent. can be accounted for by immigration, we must reckon on considerably more than a million first voters every four years. And there will naturally be a slight continuous increase in the percentage.

Adding, then, ten per cent., as the most conservative estimate of increase, to the 13,923,102 votes cast in November, 1896, it is reasonable to suppose that at least 15,315,412 votes will be cast for President on November 7th, 1900. That is to say, about 1,400,000 more electors will vote for President this year than four years ago.

But it is not accurate to treat all this increase as new voters, or rather as first voters. To be admitted to citizenship, the ordinary immigrant, who has not enlisted in and been honorably discharged from the army, must have "resided continuously in the United States for at least five years." Evidently this condition will bar from a vote next month all immigrants, otherwise eligible, who did not land prior to November 7th, 1895, and who did not properly follow up their arrival by declaring their intention to become citizens. A Presidential election has been held since that date, but none of the adult male immigrants who arrived in this country subsequent to November, 1891, could have voted in November, 1896. Therefore, all the adult male immigrants who arrived in the United States in the last two months of 1891, and in the years 1892, 1893, 1894, and in ten months of 1895, may vote in November, 1900, if they have complied with the law. The total number of immigrants arriving in that period was about 1,767,144. One-fifth of that number would be 353,228. In round numbers there are 350,000 immigrant adults who may cast their first Presidential vote next month. Nearly all of them will do so. Our newly admitted foreign-born citizens seem to have a higher opinion of the value of the franchise than some whose families have been here for a hundred years or so.

Deducting this estimate of 350,000 electors naturalized since the last Presidential election, we still have more than 1,000,000 young Americans to cast their first votes in November, and thereby to decide whether Mr. Bryan or Mr. McKinley shall go into the White House on the fourth of next March.

Mr. McKinley's plurality in 1896 was 601,854. There are twice as many voters now coming to the polls, in addition to 350,000 citizens naturalized since 1896. The right sort of an appeal to these new voters is all important.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There can be no doubt that these electors casting their first Presidential ballot will decide this Presidential election.

How are the majority of the new voters likely to go? Which of the two great parties will they choose—for I assume they will not throw away their votes by casting a ballot for Caffery, or for any crank ticket? Where do the interests of the young men lie?

Coming to the United States more than fifty years ago, I have had, boy and man, opportunities of watching what is to me the most significant change this wonderful half century has wrought. I, too, have experienced the perplexities and thought out the responsibilities attendant on the right casting of a first vote. In the year 1864, at the age of twenty-one, I cast my first ballot. I felt then that the Democratic party was the young man's party; that the young blood of the nation must naturally be drawn toward Democracy, which made a ready place for the newcomers, and welcomed them to a share in the management of the affairs, even into the councils, of the nation. Nor, in the thirty-six years since I cast a ballot for George B. McClellan, have I seen any good cause for changing my views on this subject. It is, indeed, my deliberate opinion that the Democratic party is the only party which offers an even chance to the first voter, not only in the political contest, but in the battle of life as well.

The struggle for existence has gradually become harder and harder in the United States. Man has a right to more than bare existence. Yet the competition between organized wealth and individual effort grows more and more cruel. Everywhere is felt the greedy grasp of corporate monopoly, destroying the first voter's opportunity of making his way in the world; closing the little shops in which his father made a fair living for himself and his family; absorbing one line of individual business after another; converting the successful lawyers into corporation advisers, driving the others into poorly paid clerkships; concentrating into the hands of the few the opportunities which were formerly open to the honorable competition of the many. Must the young men of the United States clerk for corporations at home, or fight for corporations in the Philippines, and see the other avenues of life gradually closed by the inexorable grip of the Trusts?

I do not believe the first voters in November, 1900, are going to stand for anything like that, or vote for any party which offers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them no better prospects for achieving success in public or private life.

This is a young country. The young men must decide its destiny. Will they cast their first votes for William Jennings Bryan, the youngest Presidential candidate of the century, young in blood, young in ambition, young in the healthy activities of life, willing to give them all a new chance in the world, representing the party of young men all over the country? I believe the new voters will answer this question in November by a tremendous majority for Bryan and Democracy.

RICHARD CROKER.

V.

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST POSITION.

If it were not that an attitude of something like intolerance has found expression to an ominous extent among Administration partisans concerning the Anti-Imperialist movement, it would seem that the existence of an active agitation in the United States of a great public question needed no apology. De Tocqueville has only expanded the aphorism that vigilance is the price of liberty in "Democracy in America," and every student of our institutions has recognized the fact that independent and vigorous criticism is not merely permissible, but that it is the only safeguard of our liberties. Governor Roosevelt asserts, in his "Life of Benton," that the most dangerous element in the community is not what is called the criminal class, but a non-combatant class like the Quakers. The assertion is a characteristically vicious one; but the Rough Rider would be justified in the contention that, in civil affairs, the complacent and inactive citizen comes pretty near being a criminal. Nevertheless, one of the most eminent and honored citizens of a city famous for public spirit and patriotism —and it is to be feared representative of it in this as in other matters—has contented himself in the crisis of 1898-1900 with a passive attitude of acquiescence in the course of the Administration, "because the President must know more about public matters than the people, and the President can be trusted." Were such a precept generally followed, the fate of the Republic would be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

justly sealed, and its citizenship would be forfeited by demonstrated unworthiness.

Whatever the result of the Anti-Imperialist cause, it will be set down in history that a generous, philanthropic and loyal movement grew up in the United States, which, in spite of bitter obloquy, artful appeals to selfishness and to every vulgar and glittering motive, and in spite of opposition by all the unscrupulous influences of a party supported by an enormous money power, has stirred the whole country and dictated the policy of a great national organization.

The momentous character of the imperial aggression transcends the issues of the Civil War, or those of any imaginable question that could be presented to a Republic. Its aim is more deadly than to rend the Republic in twain. We believe that it is to sap the sources of its life and to sow the seeds of its destruction. Its most bigoted adherent cannot minimize the fact that the addition of tropical and unassimilable peoples, in permanent colonial relations, to our Republic is the most tremendous departure conceivable from our traditions and principles and practice. No mere phrases ringing changes upon "expansion," "world power" and "destiny", can disguise the right and duty of each citizen to ponder, and decide for himself, propositions so serious and so pregnant that the attempt which has been made to forestall his judgment concerning them is in itself the grossest act of Imperialism.

The few words which follow are to treat of the historical, the legal or constitutional, the commercial-financial and the ethical aspects of the paramount question, the wrong side of which is represented by William McKinley, and the right by William Jennings Bryan.

The history of the Imperialistic movement is perfectly authenticated by official reports, by contemporaneous testimony given by those who have afterwards tried to recede from compromising positions under obvious influences, and by the evidence of civilians, officials, travellers and newspaper correspondents, sometimes by the news telegraphed and written and sometimes by the significant absence of news when the censor interposed to prevent its dispatch. Unfortunately, there are many self-contradictions in written and spoken words by persons in high places. It would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ill become a writer in these pages to accuse the President or his commanding generals or civil subordinates of falsehood. That the contradictory statements automatically accuse their authors is a circumstance beyond his control. The publications of the Anti-Imperialist League, which can be consulted by any person who desires to know the truth, have established a series of facts which will be authentic material for the future historian of the United States, whatever contemporaneous treatment they may receive.

(1.) The secret correspondence of the Government, at an early period of the war with Spain, indicated its interest in the Philippine Islands as a possession.

(2.) The dealings with Aguinaldo, as the leader of the military forces of the Filipinos, by Consul Wildman, Consul Pratt, Admiral Dewey, General Anderson and other officers and representatives of the United States, were, until the capture of Manila was effected by the co-operation of the native troops, allowed to go on, with the distinct knowledge by these officials and representatives that Aguinaldo and his people believed, and had reason to believe, that their independence was to be the result of the joint campaign, in case of its success.*

(3.) The Philippine Government at Malolos, under an excellent constitution, was set up on September 15th, 1898, with a Congress of the chosen representatives of the Tagalog and Visayan races, embracing a large majority of the civilized tribes of the whole archipelago,† with the tacit consent of the functionaries of the United States then present in the Philippines.

(4.) A change of attitude toward the native people, their rulers and their military officers abruptly took place, in compliance with inspiration from Washington; the native launches which had been saluted by our officers when flying the Filipino flag were seized; and our lines about Manila were pressed forward, in spite of the stipulation in the protocol with Spain that the *status quo* should be sacredly respected.

(5.) The Filipinos were denied admittance to the sessions of the Peace Commission at Paris; and, though the President had at first let it be known that he intended only to ask for an island or a coaling station, he changed his instructions and caused his representatives to demand the whole archipelago, inserting the clause

*"I never treated them as allies, except to make use of them."—Dewey.
†Report of Senator Lodge, Chairman of the Committee on the Philippines, Fifty-Sixth Congress, first session, Senate document 171.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the $20,000,000 payment to Spain, to avoid the complications which might arise from the fact that we had made no conquest beyond Manila.

(6.) The opponents of the treaty in the Senate were so numerous that, though challenged to do so, the Administration did not venture to submit its ratification to a vote. The writer's presence in the Senate and in the Marble Room during these critical sessions,—laboring for the rejection of the treaty,—gives him the opportunity to offer personal testimony to the progress of events. On the night of Friday, February 3d, 1899, the Administration leaders came to the leaders of the Opposition, and virtually confessed themselves beaten by asking what form of joint resolution, declaratory of the intention of the United States to grant the Filipinos independence, would be satisfactory to them. Whatever influences might have been exerted upon Senators, a sufficient vote to defeat the ratification of the treaty seemed assured, unless such a concession were made. The White House, however, did not back up its representatives in the compromise which they had proposed. It had still another card to play. Though Senator Wellington told the writer that, "if the President would allow his private assurances of his intentions to give independence to the Filipinos to be made public", the treaty could be easily ratified, Mr. McKinley still declined to allow any such pledge to be made. Why?

(7.) While the treaty was before the Senate, the President had issued a proclamation on December 21st, 1898, ordering the immediate extension of the sovereignty of the United States and its military government "to the whole of the ceded territory."* This proclamation, General Otis declared, was certain "to incite widespread hostilities", and he actually endeavored to suppress it and supersede it by a conciliatory address of an entirely different character. As a commentary on these transactions, the words of President McKinley at Pittsburg, August 28th, 1899, may be quoted: "Until the treaty was ratified we had no authority beyond Manila city, bay and harbor. We then had no other title to defend, no authority beyond that to maintain."

(8.) Though the original proclamation was promulgated through the misunderstanding of an inferior officer, and though an intense feeling of suspicion was aroused, while our soldiers indicated by their aggravating conduct that they were still

*"Report of General E. S. Otis, Aug. 31st, 1899.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spoiling for a fight and still pressed back the Filipino lines,—to the everlasting credit of Aguinaldo and his army, no serious outbreak had yet occurred.

(9.) The immediate cause of the ratification of the treaty was furnished by the attack on the Filipino lines, February 4th, 1899,* when the principal officers of the Filipino forces were absent, and the American lines sprang into action with ready equipment and instant celerity. The affair was reported to the United States Senate as an attack upon the United States forces by the Filipinos, and thus, at last, the votes needed for the ratification of the treaty were obtained.

(10.) The immediate request by the Filipino leader for an armistice and a neutral zone was refused by the United States commander,† and ever since a war has been prosecuted by the Administration, with no quarter and no hope of quarter unless through the absolute submission of a nation, once our allies against a common foe, and fighting for a liberty which we had virtually promised them, with a courage and persistence which makes them worthy of it, if any people ever were.‡

The Constitutional aspect of the imperial aggression has been discussed by many writers and speakers according to their points of view. It seems hardly necessary to controvert the extreme assertions which have been made, that the sanction of a treaty with a foreign nation can supersede the sanctions of a Constitution. The right of the Congress to dispose of territory, which has been availed of in similar cases, obviously makes it possible to transfer such sovereignty as has been acquired in the Philippine Islands to their inhabitants. The authority to retain them as territory and to govern them permanently outside of the Constitution, will doubtless be sought from the Supreme Court, as the recognition of an existing politi-

*"Firing upon the Filipinos and the killing of one of them by the Americans, leading to return fire."—Maj.-Gen. E. S. Otis. Report up to April 6, 1899.

†"Feb. 9, 1899. "Aguinaldo now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference; have declined to answer."—Maj.-Gen. E. S. Otis's report. This statement, confirmed by General C. McReeve, has recently been denied by General Otis, who says his own "dispatch" was "misleading!"

‡"I do not think so meanly of the most unscrupulous advocate of a policy of aggression and subjugation as to doubt that, if the case were reversed, and we or he were in the place of Aguinaldo and the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, he would resist to the last extremity and would counsel his countrymen to resist to the last extremity. But we are yet to learn of what temper these islanders are made; whether their powers of endurance are equal to their courage and their love of liberty."—Letter from the Hon. Geo. F. Hoar, March 29, 1899.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cal fact. Hitherto, the march of the Constitution, as the progress of the interpretations of that instrument has been called where doubts existed, has been enlightened by the principles of the Declaration of Independence. John Marshall, who has been justly characterized as the guide, the light and the defender of the Constitution, won his imperishable fame by the diligence with which he sought the attainment of those objects for which it is declared to have been instituted. While Marshall might not have adopted the strict construction in the Dred Scott case maintained by Judge Taney and his associates, because it involved the extension of human slavery contrary to the spirit of the instrument and of the Declaration of Independence, it can hardly be doubted that now, since this construction involves, under the changed conditions, the extension of liberty, Marshall would have to-day maintained that very construction. The survivors of those who then opposed it may now support that construction with absolute consistency. If the Supreme Court is still inspired by the spirit of its great leaders, its illumination, from the Declaration of Independence and the traditions of the Government, will enlighten its counsels so that the contentions of the present Administration will be defeated, and those arrogated powers which have been exerted with such fatal results will be overthrown. Then Porto Rico must have statehood or it must be alienated, and the Philippines must have statehood or they must be alienated.

It is a part of the Constitutional or legal aspect of the matter, that no embarrassment need be feared from possible complications involved in such a protectorate as has been suggested for the Philippines, or which might be implied by an enfranchised Porto Rico. Who can doubt that the nations of the world would accept, at the suggestion of the United States, the neutralization of these countries, as in the case of Belgium and Switzerland?

Finally, it should be noted that the Administration has never even suggested the obvious and legal method by way of amendment to the Constitution for so vast an extension of the powers of the Government, but that it has endeavored to foist upon the people a party measure, which transcends in importance any change of which its authors could have dreamed.

There are several aspects in which the commercial or financial results of tropical colonial expansion may be regarded, all equally

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fatal to the specious arguments which have been exploited by the friends of the Administration.

(1.) The consideration of the balance between the cost of subjugation, now called "policing" vassal states, and any possible profit therefrom, is one of the most interesting of these. The expenses incurred on account of the Philippines are at the rate of about $200,000,000 per annum. There is no immediate prospect of any considerable reduction in this pretty little bill. The total sum of the exports and imports of the archipelago has not exceeded $30,000,000 a year. Let the Imperialist indicate any possible source of increase in the consuming or producing power of the islands which can overcome the frightful debit.

(2.) It is impossible to believe, after the uprising against the "scuttle" policy of the Administration in the matter of the Porto Rican tariff, that the tyrannical policy could be maintained of imposing duties to prevent colonial productions from competing with our own industries. Thus the sugar growing of tropical dependencies, promoted by our own capital, will ruin the sugar industry of the United States. The tobacco trade will, by similar means, be largely transferred to these favorable regions. Labor will be brought to the level of the standard of Asiatic living. For, even though sovereignty did not imply freedom of movement on the part of the subject peoples, the indentured labor system, a form of slavery, which English emissaries are endeavoring to induce the United States to graft upon our colonial system after the example of Great Britain, would probably sooner or later be adopted by the Imperialists.

(3.) The ultimate result of the extension of our Eastern policy to China is easily foreseen. A development of commercial opportunity in that densely populated country, to which we are pointed with such enthusiasm, means what? Not a market but a menace—the opportunity to export some tools and machinery to create Chinese industries which may soon supply the markets of the world. As Richtofen says: "The slumbering factors of an immense industrial production all exist here." There are already five large cotton mills in Shanghai. Wages average about ten cents a day, and the ready adaptiveness of the labor is indicated by the fact that productive capacity has increased twenty-five per cent. in one year. Not prosperity but ruin and disaster are the auguries of expansion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The ethical side of a condition which has followed avoidable war need only, it might be supposed, be calmly contemplated to arouse the conscience of the whole nation in vehement opposition. In Cuba, a population on the verge of revolution; a broken and bitter subject race in Porto Rico; in the Philippines, a defiant and persistent enemy. Corruption in the Administration, horrible licensed vice in Manila, the outrages of an irregular contest beyond even the cruel laws of war and the chartered savagery of barbarous allies, the treatment of Catholic Christians as heathens, the desecration of churches, rapine, ravishing and murder; in what a horrible propaganda of wickedness the United States has been engaged for months, which are now gathering up their dread account into years. This explains the censorship which keeps the truth from America. While all these horrors are going on, because they do not come within reach of the senses, the defenders of the Administration rely upon the comfort and prosperity which are as yet superficially apparent in domestic affairs to dull the ears and steel the hearts of the American people. It is the old Imperial idea that nothing matters while there is a plenty of bread and circuses. It is impossible that we should long remain thus callous; but, even should we otherwise do so, there is reason to expect that the inflation of a vastly expanded currency is about to collapse, and that wages, which have not now the purchasing power of four years ago, will be reduced or cut off, and that bad times will arouse the people to the wrong which is being done at home and abroad.

As for the bogie which the Republican party is trying to manufacture out of the corpse embalmed in the Democratic Platform, it may be said that, if it has any living menace, the mind which could place the Silver Issue in the same plane with or above the issue of Imperialism would have sacrificed the Union in the war between the States, rather than have risked the depression of the currency.

President McKinley, as Governor Boutwell has eloquently said, was given "an opportunity for the enrollment of his name with that of the Czar of Russia, who emancipated millions of hereditary serfs; with the name of Lincoln, a name that can never die; with the name of the Emperor of Brazil, who struck the shackles from the last slave on the American continent. Presi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dent McKinley could have said to the inhabitants of Porto Rico and the Philippines: "We have acquired the title of Spain, such as it is; but your title, by possession, is the better title. We are prepared to surrender the Spanish title to you. The yoke of Imperialism is broken. Organize free governments and prepare to found free states, and thus to create happy and prosperous commonwealths."

He has refused the great opportunity. "And this is the writing that was written,—'Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin'."

ERVING WINSLOW.

VI.

THE VITAL ISSUES OF THE CAMPAIGN.

THE crucial issue of this Presidential campaign is, whether we shall keep or lose our present prosperity at home and our new gains and prestige abroad. We know what we now have. We know that a change of Administration would reverse our existing policies, both domestic and foreign, and overturn their results. The decisive question of the hour is whether the American people want such a change.

There are many broad differences between the policies and purposes of the two great parties, as now led. They touch the sanctity of the courts, the power inherent in nationality, the efficiency of a protective tariff, and various other subjects. But, while other matters are at stake and will be affected by the result, the battle this year is waged over two central and conclusive questions. First: Shall we maintain the existing gold standard, with business confidence and stability, or shall we change to the silver standard, with an immediate and inevitable financial convulsion? Second: Shall we fulfill the duties and responsibilities and preserve the advantages which have come to us with the expansion of our country, or shall we renounce the obligations of our victories and abandon all that we have gained?

Whatever other phases may be suggested, whatever sidelights may be thrown on the contest, the vital struggle turns on these two salient and overshadowing propositions. The paramount issue of a campaign is determined, not by the assertion of any candidate or convention, but by the obvious effect of the election

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the relative importance of its results in their bearing on the welfare of the people. It is fixed, not by declarations, but by events and consequences. We measure issues by practical tests. We knew and felt the hard times from 1893 to 1897. We know and feel the good times since. Both conditions were and are visible, tangible and palpable. They are within the consciousness of every man. They have directly affected every man's interest and well-being.

We hear a great deal about "Imperialism" as a paramount issue, but who sees it or feels it as we see and feel hard times or good times? Whatever it is, it is already here, according to the phantom-fanciers; it has been here ever since our flag waved over the new possessions; with such Cæsarism actually oppressing us, we ought to know it and groan under it. But, as a matter of fact, are there any real evils which men are suffering from it, and of which they are so conscious that, in order to escape these evils, they are ready for business panic and calamity? The supporters of President McKinley point to a real, living, unparalleled prosperity, and contend that the success of their opponents would blight it and bring disaster. The supporters of Mr. Bryan point to an imaginary "Imperialism," and contend that the success of their opponents would continue it. Would the continuance of this spectre, whatever it may be, have any such direct and vital bearing on the immediate interests, happiness and welfare of the people as a change from good times to hard times? Which, then, is the paramount issue?

If Mr. Bryan's election would produce the result of overturning our existing prosperity, this question manifestly transcends all others in importance. If any issue he represents involves that effect, it is plainly paramount, whether called so or not. No other question, significant as it may be, can approach in supreme consequence that of preserving the general well-being, content and success of the great body of the people. Now, our present prosperity can be wrecked and general disaster produced, either by the actual adoption of the silver standard or by such menace and fear of its adoption as would destroy confidence. Mr. Bryan was defeated in 1896 because the country realized that his election would bring in free silver and the silver standard, with its destruction of confidence, its unsettlement of values, its paralysis of enterprise and industry, and its universal losses. He

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

holds to the same policy now, and, in the event of his election, what is to prevent the same result?

He publicly declares that the gold standard shall not remain, if he is able to get rid of it. If he is honest and sincere in the convictions he has expressed for years, he is bound to make warfare on the gold standard. The way for attack is just as clear now as it was in 1896, except for the currency law passed last winter. That is the only obstacle to the silver standard which did not exist when Mr. Bryan was running before. It is an effective barrier in the hands of an Administration that wants to make it such. But it is only a statutory enactment, capable of being amended by another Congress, or of being neutralized by an unfriendly Administration. A popular current strong enough to elect Mr. Bryan would inevitably elect a Bryan House of Representatives. It would carry States with Senatorial elections pending that would assure a close and doubtful Senate. A President aggressively for the free coinage of silver at sixteen to one and an uncertain and plastic Congress would make it an imminent danger. Even if Congress did nothing, a compliant Secretary of the Treasury, agreeing with Mr. Bryan and obedient to his directions, could pay coin obligations in silver and practically paralyze the statute. Law does not enforce itself. It is inert unless executed. A hostile and ineffective Administration makes it a dead letter.

But the deadly effect would be felt without waiting for direct action. The menace and fear of the silver standard, even before its accomplishment, would blight our prosperity. The election of Mr. Bryan would at once excite that alarm. He has publicly announced that he would summon the new Congress in extra session immediately on taking his seat. If he were elected in November, the country would know that, in four months, the Pandora's box of evils of a silver President and a dubious Congress would be opened. The uncertainty and apprehension thus created would destroy the general sense of confidence and security. Nobody would know what to count on. Confidence is the vital breath of trade and enterprise. Destroy confidence, and you undermine the foundation of men's dealings. Values would tumble, panic would come, and widespread disaster would follow.

And it must not be overlooked that the disaster would be greater now than it would have been in 1896. It is the character-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

istic of human nature, long associated with possible perils, to minimize them and lose its dread. Pompeii, familiar with the terrors of Vesuvius, ceased to fear until the fiery avalanche came. The submersion and destruction of Galveston from a tornado and a tidal wave had long been predicted, but years of escape had bred thoughtlessness of the danger. Johnstown grew and prospered and lived merrily under an overhanging reservoir, but at last the cataclysm overtook it. In 1896, the menace of the silver standard, with all its perils, was new and startled the country. The awakened sense of a great possible catastrophe put us on guard, and it was warded off. That escape, and continued familiarity with a threat which did not eventuate, have served to benumb and deaden the general sense of danger; but, in reality, the calamity of Mr. Bryan's election, with the consequent financial convulsion and business distress, would be far severer now than it would have been in 1896.

The reason is that we have more to lose. We have farther to fall. We should be plunged to the same depths from a higher altitude. In 1896, we had already suffered four years of hard times and low prices. Widespread bankruptcy, universal depression and a general fall of values had brought us down toward the silver level. We should have dropped, but dropped from a low plane. On the other hand, if we fall now we shall fall from a loftier height with more disastrous results. Prices, values, securities, wages are all far higher than they were in 1896. They are on the recognized and accepted gold level, with the buoyancy of unprecedented prosperity, and a fall to the silver level would produce an immeasurable shock. The sudden realization of such a possibility through Mr. Bryan's election would immediately shatter confidence, and cause the greatest financial convulsion the country has ever seen. Our markets are more closely connected with those of Europe than ever before. With our present splendid financial standing we have become a creditor nation The Powers of Europe are coming to us for large loans. The upheaval of our markets by the threat of the silver standard would convulse the Bourses of London, Paris and Berlin, which would react here, and the sweeping extent of the financial, business and industrial calamity would be beyond calculation.

In domestic affairs, therefore, the vital issue of the campaign is between the gold standard and the silver standard, between

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prosperity and panic. In the very nature of the case, because it directly touches the daily life and well-being of every man, woman and child in the country, this issue must overshadow all others in practical importance. When we pass to the questions which have grown out of the Spanish war and of the resulting territorial acquisitions, the attitudes of the two candidates are equally distinct, and the conclusion must be equally decisive. These questions are substantially concentrated in the discussion over the Philippines. President McKinley recognizes the duty of maintaining our sovereignty and giving the people of the islands self-government as fast as they are prepared for it. He follows Jefferson's course in Louisiana and Monroe's in Florida. Mr. Bryan, on the other hand, proposes to abandon our sovereignty, to set up a supreme government of Aguinaldo and his followers, to recognize its independence, and to maintain its independence and authority against domestic violence and foreign aggression by an American protectorate.

Here are two distinct, sharply defined plans of procedure. What they involve must, under limitations of space, be stated in few words. President McKinley's plan holds what we have gained; maintains our authority, which is recognized by all of the outside world and accepted by all of the Filipinos, except a small and diminishing band of insurgents whose insurrection will cease the moment he is re-elected; requires no additional but a decreasing force; and develops the inhabitants into self-rule. Mr. Bryan's plan surrenders the only authority now existing in the islands; undertakes to establish the rule of Aguinaldo; precipitates a bloody conflict among the inharmonious tribes, which, while bowing to us, will not recognize each other's dominance; leaves the islands open to foreign complications and aggression; and, after giving a free hand to the Filipinos, commits us to protect them against these inevitable dangers. Mr. Bryan's idea, as indicated both in his earlier speech and in his recent letter of acceptance, is to protect them by the Monroe doctrine. This shows an astonishing confusion of mind. The Monroe doctrine is a policy framed for the protection of this hemisphere and limited to the American half of the world. Europe recognizes and respects it, because it is confined to the two Americas. Undertake to extend it to Europe or Asia or Africa, and it would break down here. In assuming to apply it for the protection of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Philippines, Mr. Bryan would destroy its force for the protection of America.

Besides thus dealing the dealiest blow at the Monroe doctrine through its complete misconception and misapplication, his policy would equally approach the militarism and imperialism he professes to abhor. There is no imperialism in lawfully maintaining our rightful sovereignty, as we do in Alaska. There is no militarism in suppressing revolt against our authority, as we do in Arizona. But, in undertaking to set up the government of another power where we had expressly surrendered sovereignty and title, Mr. Bryan's policy involves imperial prerogative. And in assuming responsibility for Aguinaldo's administration, while abdicating all authority of our own, it would require a far larger force than is needed to maintain our existing rights, and would give an exhibit of militarism. His policy for the Philippines is as fatal as his policy of free silver.

CHARLES EMORY SMITH.

VII.

PRESIDENT M'KINLEY OR PRESIDENT BRYAN?

The American people have come to know that each of the candidates for the Presidency is a man of strong and forceful personality. The notion that either is a man of weak intelligence, or uncertain will, controlled by some stronger nature, has gone by. President McKinley has not only been Chief Executive of the United States for nearly four years, but he has been Chief Executive in his own mind. I was told—what I do not doubt in the least—by an eminent Senator who was at one time popularly supposed to make up the President's mind for him every morning, that he had been to the White House to talk politics with the President but twice during the whole winter, except on such local matters as all Senators are consulted about, and that, in many of his visits to the President in leisure hours, politics or public affairs were not mentioned at all. President McKinley has exerted a large personal force, concealed in a quiet courtesy of manner, and tempered by great kindness of heart and considerate respect for other men, ever since he entered the public service as a young soldier during the War of the Rebellion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is but the idlest folly to deny that Mr. Bryan, who, in a single speech, took by storm the National Convention of a great party then full of an exultant, though vain, hope of triumph, compelled it to discard all its old leaders and to adopt him and his theories, and who, after one signal defeat, has maintained himself not merely as a leader, but a dictator, in spite of the remonstrances of the wisest, ablest and most popular of the party chieftains, is possessed of a strong will, a vigorous understanding, and an earnest and steadfast purpose. Without being President, he has twice compelled the Democratic party to take him as a candidate, and dictated a platform setting forth his own opinions, or the doctrines he thinks will command success for him in his political aspirations. If he shall be President, he will compel his party to renominate him again on such a platform as he shall think fit. There have been Presidential elections in which the personal quality of the candidate made little difference, except as he might happen to have more or less the gift of attracting votes. Pierce would have done pretty much the same thing as Buchanan did, and Buchanan as Pierce did. Monroe would have done pretty much the same thing as Madison. Sherman would have done pretty much the same thing as Harrison. Seymour would have done pretty much the same thing as McClellan. But each of the candidates this year not only means to be elected President if he can, but means to be President himself after he is elected.

There are two classes of men whose minds are made up. I will not say that all argument will be thrown away upon them. But all arguments I can make would be thrown away upon them. One is the zealous partisan, who follows party wherever it leads. To him the party and its President, or its candidate for the Presidency, are what the Holy Father and the Church are to the devout Catholic. He has no opinion of his own. He looks to his party to furnish his platform and political leader, as the zealous devotee of the Church looks to it alike for doctrine and for spiritual guide.

The other class comprehends a great variety of men—Populists, Socialists, Anarchists—men who think the free coinage of silver a panacea for all sorrows; men who have a special crotchet which they think will reconstruct society. To neither of these, nor to the thorough Democratic partisan, is it worth while to address political discussion now.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are two classes of men open to argument. Many of them are still undecided. If they unite to support Mr. McKinley, it will make his election sure.

First, there is the conservative Democrat. He is probably a free-trader, unless, as is quite apt to be the case, he is himself engaged in a protected industry. He has no faith in the National authority to protect the negro, or to secure fair elections. He has been a Democrat always, as was his father before him, unless possibly he may be the son of a Hunker Whig who opposed the war and the Constitutional amendments. He has a general dislike of Republican ways and Republican leaders. But he believes in public honesty, in sound finance, in the authority of the Supreme Court; and he has no sort of respect for Mr. Bryan, for Populism, or Socialism, and does not wish to risk the safety of his investments, or the value of his comfortable property. He is doubting whether it is not better to continue Republican power for another term, and calmly bear the ills we have, than to fly to those we know not of, under Mr. Bryan. He hopes, also, that if Bryan be thoroughly defeated once more, the Democratic party may be purified, and be fit again for his support. I think he will vote for McKinley, or he will not vote at all. But he will not look to me for counsel, and I have nothing in the way of argument adapted to persuade him.

The other man in doubt is the Anti-Imperialist Republican. He has been saying all his life that all men are created equal in political rights, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. He thinks the United States have no right to hold vassals or subjects. He is a great expansionist; but the expansion he believes in is the extension of the country by adding new States and enlarging the population of freemen. He believes there is such a thing as Imperialism, in spite of the disclaimer of his Republican friends. When anybody says the Philippine Islands are ours, he understands that to be Imperialism, and he replies, "The Philippine Islands belong to the Philippine people." When anybody says, "We will establish for them such good government as we think they are fit for," he answers, "That is Imperialism. They are entitled to establish for themselves such government as they think good and fit for themselves." That he calls Anti-Imperialism. He is considering just now, painfully and sorrowfully, whether he will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vote the Republican ticket or no. Perhaps he will listen to a few suggestions before he decides. To him I wish to appeal.

First. Either William McKinley or William J. Bryan is to be the next President. Unless you vote for one or the other, you will vote in the air. You may as well leave your vote with the census officer, or with the grocer, as with the election officer, unless you vote for one or the other of these two men.

Now, some things have happened in the past which, however you regard them, cannot be helped now. The treaty with Spain has been ratified. We have had eighteen months of war in the Philippine Islands. Instead of another Japan, taking its high rank among the powers of the earth; instead of Cuba, sending its youth to our shores, grateful to us as their liberators from centuries of oppression, to sit docile learners at our feet, we have a sullen, angry and shattered people. Whatever has caused all this, whether it was a mistake, or whether it was the inevitable cost of the discharge of a great duty, we cannot help it now. We have to deal with the future.

Now, the only question for the Republican Anti-Imperialist is, whether the chance that Mr. Bryan and the Democrats will do what the Republican Anti-Imperialist thinks should be done in the future, which will not be done by Mr. McKinley and the Republicans, is worth the price he is to pay for it if he votes for Mr. Bryan. It is not whether we should instantly withdraw from the Philippine Islands; it is not whether the abandonment of our claim to hold them in subjection be worth accomplishing at the cost of national bankruptcy, or financial distress, at the cost of free trade and the ruin of our manufactures, at the cost of repeating again the nightmare of Democratic administration. If we concede that we are willing to go through with that, if we can only get back to the Declaration of Independence again, still that is not the important question now. The important question now is: Is there anything that Mr. Bryan can be trusted to do about it that is worth the cost of giving him the power to do what he will do, if he can, in other matters?

Now, let us understand exactly the price we are asked to pay, and then let us understand exactly what reasonable hope there is that Mr. Bryan can or will accomplish anything for the independence of the Philippine people, if he be elected. You agree, my friend, that the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 means

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national dishonor, great injury to business, the reduction by half of all savings, the destruction of the standard of value—making all business transactions gambling transactions, and a great reduction, not only of the savings of the wage-earner, but of the wages he is to earn hereafter. Now, can Mr. Bryan put us on a silver basis, and will he? He says he will, and he says he can.

At Knoxville, Tenn., Sept. 16, 1896, he said: "If there is any one who believes the gold standard is a good thing, or that it must be maintained, I warn him not to cast his vote for me, because I promise him it will not be maintained in this country longer than I am able to get rid of it."

And at Topeka, when he accepted the Populists' nomination the other day, he told them:

"No Populist, however sanguine, believes it possible to elect a Populist President at this time, but the Populist party may be able to determine whether a Democrat or a Republican will be elected.

"If the fusion forces win a victory this fall, we shall see the reform accomplished"—he was speaking of monetary reform—"before the next Presidential election, and with its accomplishment the people will find it easier to secure any remedial legislation which they may desire."

He means to do just that thing. He believes he can do it by Executive power, and believes, as he says, that "with its accomplishment the people will find it easier to secure any remedial legislation which they may desire." Monetary reform first, remedial legislation next, is what he promises to do.

Mr. Secretary Gage says he can do it, and that he can do it by the exercise of the lawful power now lodged in the Executive. Some people think Mr. Gage is mistaken in his conception of the extent of the Executive power under existing laws. But whether he be mistaken or no, have you any doubt that Mr. Bryan agrees with him, and that he will not hesitate to do what he now promises to do, what he has the great authority of the Republican Secretary of the Treasury for saying that he can lawfully do? You think to do it means national dishonor and business ruin. So you are to pay national dishonor and business ruin as part only of the cost of getting a President who now professes to agree with you about the Philippine Islands.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now, in four Southern States, by an ingenious device, they have undertaken to legalize the disfranchisement of the negro, and to overturn all the Constitutional amendments. Two other States are about doing the same thing. If they succeed, there can be no question that the same thing will be done in every other Southern State, with one or two possible exceptions. Now, with that accomplished, there will be disfranchised ten million American citizens at home. It will give the Southern white Democrats fifty or sixty Representatives, and the same number of votes in the Electoral College, not dependent upon numbers, and representing sheer usurpation. It will not only disfranchise ten million American citizens in the Southern States, whose numbers are, of course, to increase with every census, but it will disfranchise to that extent the free white citizens of the North. In every future election, the Republican party of the North is to play against Tammany Hall and the Southern Democracy, and the latter will hold these loaded dice. It may be that we cannot baffle the purpose which has already been so far accomplished. But the express mandate of the Constitution is that in such case the representation of the offending States shall be proportionately diminished. I am not now waving the bloody shirt. I am not now reviving the old issues. I am not now talking about election laws, or laws for the suppression of violence. I am simply calling your attention to the question, whether you mean to be disfranchised yourselves, and to have fifty or sixty Southern Democratic Representatives in the national House of Representatives to vote you down for the indefinite future. Now, nobody will dream for a moment that, if Bryan and the Democratic party shall come into power, this Constitutional mandate will be obeyed. And you, a Republican; you, a friend of equality; you, who believe that governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed; you, who believe that all men are equal in political rights; you, who mean that your government, at least, shall rest on your own consent, and that you are yourself equal in political rights to the best Southern Democrat that ever trod the country's soil—are asked to sustain this thing in the next Presidential election by your vote, because Mr. William J. Bryan says he is in favor of justice and freedom and independence in the Far East.

Another thing: I agree that it is not equal in importance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the two considerations I have stated. You have believed that the prosperity of the American workman, and of the American employer, the prosperity of labor and capital alike, the comfort of the workman's home, the independence of American manufacture, depend on our protective system for which you have been working and voting ever since you came to manhood. Will Mr. Bryan and his party have learned anything by experience? They are pledged to overthrow that if they can, and they ask you, without disguise of their purpose, to help them to overthrow that, if they can.

Another thing: Mr. Bryan stands in 1900 on the platform of 1896. He will, if he can, fill the Supreme Court of the United States, whose membership is now largely composed of old men, with judges of his way of thinking. You are to commit to him that august tribunal, which has been our rock of defense and our ark of safety so often. When you bring a President into power, you bring with him into power, as his counsellors, the men who have been his political companions and advisers, and who have contributed most to his elevation. I will not name names. But the intelligent Republican who is hesitating as to his duty now, knows very well who are the active and efficient Bryan men, South and North, East and West. Whom will he consult in Massachusetts? Whom will he consult in New York city and State? Whom will he consult, whose advice will he take, in the West, and in the South? Mr. Tillman, of South Carolina, of whom I have no word of disrespect, reported the Democratic platform to the Convention at Kansas City. He is, I think, an honest, manly and able statesman. He has a marvellous gift of racy speech. He has become the dominant power in his own State and section, where he overthrew the old Democratic leaders, like Hampton and Butler, with one hand, and put the Republican majority of his State under his feet with the other. This is what he said last winter in the Senate. The terrible, tragic meaning of his words is almost forgotten in our admiration for the manly frankness of the avowal.

"We took the government away. We stuffed ballot boxes. We shot them. We are not ashamed of it. The Senator from Wisconsin would have done the same thing. I see it in his eye right now. He would have done it. With that system—force, tissue ballots, etc.—we got tired ourselves. So we called a constitutional convention, and we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eliminated, as I said, all of the colored people whom we could under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

"I want to call your attention to the remarkable change that has come over the spirit of the dream of the Republicans; to remind you, gentlemen from the North, that your slogans of the past—brotherhood of man and fatherhood of God—have gone glimmering down the ages. The brotherhood of man exists no longer, because you shoot negroes in Illinois, when they come in competition with your labor, as we shoot them in South Carolina, when they come in competition with us in the matter of elections. You do not love them any better than we do. You used to pretend that you did; but you no longer pretend it, except to get their votes.

"You deal with the Filipinos just as we deal with the negroes, only you treat them a heap worse."*

Now, if you elect Mr. Bryan, the one most powerful force in Mr. Bryan's counsel at the South will be Mr. Tillman, the rising young leader of the powerful Democracy of that section, as in New York it will be Richard Croker, who has been faithful to Mr. Bryan and to his principles from the beginning, and who is the political despot of the Empire State. There are twenty million human beings, whose rights as freemen are at stake—ten million at home and ten million abroad. Will you consent to put your heel on the ten million at home, and, standing on their prostrate liberties, proclaim liberty to the nations of the world? You believe Mabini and Aguinaldo fit for self-government. So do I. You believe that Booker Washington is fit for self-government. So do I. Shall we—as Mr. Bryan and the Democratic party do, as Mr. Bryan and his Mugwump and Independent supporters do—strangle Booker Washington with one hand, and wave the flag over the head of Aguinaldo with the other?

This is the price, or a part of the price, you are to pay. You are to commit all the unknown questions of the unknown future to Mr. Bryan and his Democratic allies, if you elect him to power. What sort of statesmanship do you think they will furnish, to deal with great questions that now confront us?

Abraham Lincoln said in 1864 that it was not a good plan to swap horses while crossing the stream. Is it a good plan to swap horses while crossing the dangerous and stormy Chinese sea in a typhoon? What are you to get in the way of an equivalent for the terrible price you are asked to pay? You remember Dr. Franklin's story—trite as the a-b-c or the multiplica-

*Congressional Record, February 26, 1900, pp. 2,347-2,348.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion table; yet we may well repeat it, since the wit of man cannot improve it—of the boy who paid too dear for his whistle. Will you get anything from Mr. Bryan, except a whistle?

It is said by some of our friends that we wish to punish President McKinley and the Republican party for the great wrong they have committed. Which deserves being punished the more, President McKinley and the Republicans who made the treaty, and who voted for it, believing that the Philippine people were semi-civilized, incapable of self-government, sure to fall an easy prey to the ambition or greed of foreign nations, or wear themselves out in domestic strife, or Mr. Bryan, who, thinking as we do, by his personal influence caused the treaty to be ratified? You and I think Mr. McKinley and the Republicans who supported the treaty were all wrong in their belief. But the President negotiated the treaty, and the Senate gave its consent. Now, what did Mr. Bryan do? He thought the people of the Philippine Islands were entitled to govern themselves. He thought we had no Constitutional power to govern them. He thought that to undertake that government was to convert this Government into an Empire. He thought it was to do infinite mischief to our citizenship, and infinite wrong to the people we were to subjugate. Now, so believing, Mr. Bryan came to Washington and stabbed the cause of Anti-Imperialism in the back in the hour of its assured victory. The treaty would have been beaten, almost by a majority; at any rate, with a very large vote to spare. Mr. Bryan put forth all his power as a great political leader—the last candidate of his party for the Presidency, certain to be its next candidate—to secure the adoption of this treaty which contained and wrought, as he believed, all these evils. I will not discuss his motive. But I cannot think of any good rational explanation, except that, knowing very well that he was more likely to be beaten on them in a time of prosperity, he wished to keep this question alive for the campaign.

The Senate was the West Point of the resistance to Imperialism. It could not be captured unless the forces of one side outnumbered the forces of the other two to one. It was as if some great General and great political leader in the Revolution had surrendered West Point to the British enemy, and had induced the Continental Congress to declare by vote that George III. was the lawful sovereign, and the British Parliament the lawful legis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lature for the American Colonies. That vote made it the Constitutional duty of the President to reduce the Philippine Islands to subjection, and to restore order and peace. From that duty he could be relieved only by an act of Congress, requiring the assent of Senate and House, and his own Constitutional approval —an assent and approval which Mr. Bryan then knew full well it was utterly preposterous to expect.

Mr. Justice Grier, giving the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Prize Cases, 2 Black, 665, declared that although the President cannot initiate or declare war, he is bound to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and that by the acts of Congress of February 28, 1795, and March 3, 1807, he is authorized to call out the military and naval forces of the United States to suppress insurrection against the Government of the United States; and that although he does not initiate war, he is bound to accept the challenge without waiting for any special legislative authority, and must himself decide whether, in fulfilling his duty in suppressing an insurrection, he is met with such armed resistance as will compel him to give them the character of belligerent, and that this is a question to be decided *by him*.

Mr. Justice Nelson adds: The whole military and naval power of the United States is put under the President's control to meet such an emergency. There was some dissent as to other parts of the opinion. But in this opinion the Court was unanimous. These two judges were distinguished Democrats, and upon the Court sat at the time Taney and Catron and Clifford.

In American Insurance Co. v. Canter, 1 Peters, 511, Chief Justice Marshall says: "The Constitution confers absolutely on the government . . . the power of acquiring territory, either by conquest or by treaty. . . . If it be ceded by treaty, the acquisition is confirmed, and the ceded territory becomes a part of the nation to which it is annexed, either on the terms stipulated in the treaty of cession, or on such as its new master shall impose."

The treaty, whose adoption Mr. Bryan procured, by putting forth his whole power to secure it, declared the people of the Philippine Islands subjects of the United States. It made their warfare insurrection against the Government of the United States. It made it the Constitutional duty of the President to put that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insurrection down. It also affirmed and exercised the power of the United States to purchase sovereignty over ten million people for money, pledged the faith of the country for payment and promised that Congress, and not the people concerned, should dispose of their future. All these things Mr. Bryan helped to do. He is more responsible for them than any other man in the country, since the treaty left the hands of the Executive. When you punish President McKinley and the Republican party for what they did, you punish the country and you punish yourself. Do you not think Mr. Bryan and his seventeen followers who voted for the treaty deserve a little punishment also? You can inflict that by saving and benefiting the country, without endangering it in any degree.

Mr. Bryan says he thought the mischief would be cured by the passage of the Bacon resolution affirming our purpose to give that people self-government hereafter. Mr. Bryan, it seems to me, must have known that the passage of such a resolution was quite improbable, and that, if it had passed the Senate, it would have been of no vigor or effect whatever, a mere idle resolve, without any Constitutional potency, unless it were agreed to by the House and approved by the President. The treaty became the law of the land by the express terms of the Constitution. A treaty is greater than a common statute, because it not only is the law of the land, but it pledges the faith of the American people. Now, how idle for a gentleman aspiring to the great office of the Presidency to say: "Oh, yes, I made it the law of the land that it was the duty of Congress to govern the people of the Philippine Islands; I bought them and paid for them; I pledged the faith of the Government that this thing should be done, and that this thing should be done in this way, and I trusted to the chance hereafter that one House of Congress alone might pass a resolution that they did not mean to keep on in that policy."

But Mr. Bryan says he wanted to get the matter out of the hands of the President, and into the hands of Congress. Now, in the first place, his whole theory was and is that the Philippine Islands is a matter with which Congress has rightfully or Constitutionally nothing to do; and, in the second place, the method he took was not calculated to take the matter out of the hands of the President or to put it into the hands of Congress.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But he says he wanted to get peace with Spain, and he did not want to run the risk of making amendments to the treaty to which Spain might not consent. But he knew very well then that the war with Spain was over. Her fleets were shattered, her armies were captive, she had sued for peace, and her Commissioners had said to the people of the United States in express words, "We are in your power, and Spain is compelled to accede to any terms you may dictate." How idle is any suggestion that Spain would not gladly have acquiesced in an amendment of the treaty which put the Philippine Islands on the same footing with the people of Cuba. A cable dispatch would have brought the eager consent of Spain to such an amendment in twenty-four hours.

But Mr. Bryan says that if the treaty had been defeated, then the President would have called, after the next 4th of March, an extra session of the Senate, in which the Republican majority would have been larger, and would have secured its ratification then. I do not believe it. That would have required a delay of several months, and if Mr. Bryan had exercised his influence as a political leader against the treaty, instead of in its favor, the two-thirds majority would never have been commanded for it.

But, talking of what the Senate would have done at its extra session, can Mr. Bryan doubt that if he had got through his resolution, which failed, that it would have been repealed in six weeks? A treaty is the law of the land, as I have said, and pledges the faith of the Government. The Senate cannot abrogate it, if it would; and it will be a rare case when Congress and the President will undertake to abrogate it, if they can. But this empty resolution of Brother Bryan's, if a majority had been for it, and not against it, as it was, he knows as well as I do, and his supporters know as well as you do, would have been doomed to a life of less than six weeks, if it had ever been adopted.

If you look at Mr. Bryan's promises as to silver, you will not find them vague and unmeaning. He does not say, when he talks about his financial schemes, that he shall call an extra session of Congress, and hopes they will do something. He says the thing will be done. He means business.

If you analyze Mr. Bryan's assurances in regard to the Philippine Islands, they do not differ much, practically, as to the future, from those of the present Administration. In everything else we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have got the same Mr. Bryan and the same Democratic party. If the Democratic campaign of 1896 was, as we all believed and styled it then, "a passionate crusade of dishonor," is it any less a passionate crusade of dishonor now? Will the policy which would have overthrown the public credit then not overthrow it now? Will the policy which brought suffering into the homes of the American workingman in 1892 fail to accomplish the same result in 1900? Will the ring of a dishonest dollar, or the outcry against the disgrace of a broken promise, please the ear any better in the new century than in the old?

Have the laws of trade, and the maxims of finance, and the Constitutional rights of American citizens; has the authority and supremacy of law; has the character of Tammany Hall; have the purposes of the old Democratic leaders—changed in four years?

My zealous friend, the old story will repeat itself again. The Southern Democrat will hold you as fish to his hook as long as he wants you, and then he will toss you back, half dead, into the sea.

You and I think that the Republican party, whatever mistakes it has made, has been true to freedom and justice and righteousness in the past. The men who have composed it, and who still compose it, have wrought everything for justice and righteousness and freedom that has been wrought in this country for half a century.

It has made, in my judgment, one great mistake. But with these two parties standing side by side, promising justice and good government to this Oriental people, I trust the party that has made but one mistake, rather than the party whose sole existence has been a mistake. I prefer the Government which the Republican party has established at home, to the Governments which the Democratic party has established and has sought to establish at home. I prefer freedom and justice and equality and local self-government after the pattern of New England and Massachusetts, rather than after the pattern of Mississippi and South Carolina. I like the gospel according to McKinley better than the gospel according to Bryan. I do not believe that Mr. Bryan or his associates will do better for ten million people of another race in the Philippine Islands than they have done and mean to do for ten million American citizens in the United States. I have an assured hope, and an assured and confident faith, that this matter, in spite of the mistakes of the past, will yet be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wrought out in accordance with the old principles of the American people and the old principles of the Republican party. I thought we ought to deal with the people of the Philippine Islands as we dealt with the people of Cuba. It was a mistake not to do so. But that having been done which was done, the war having gone on, the next thing to do is to establish peace; and peace being established, if that people prove intelligent and fit for self-government, actually governing themselves in freedom and in honor, and if they desire independence, they have the right to independence; and if I know the American people, if I know the Republican party, the people of the Philippines will find no obstacle to their independence in the power of the American Republic.

GEORGE F. HOAR.

VIII.

THE COST OF A BLUNDER.

THERE are several reasons why it is more important than usual in Presidential elections that American citizens should vote right next month. Ordinarily, the Democrat and the Republican, recognizing the necessity of party alignment, can each vote his own ticket conscientiously, with a reasonable assurance that he is doing his duty to his country. Government by party is as much a part of our American administrative system as if it were embodied in the Constitution. No practical man can conceive of a method of carrying on the affairs of the Federal, State and municipal organizations without responsible heads, to whom the people can look for efficiency and integrity.

Party organizations furnish the people with their only means of enforcing this responsibility. That one of the two great parties which happens to be in power can be punished by the citizens for the misdeeds of its chosen representatives only by voting for those of the Opposition party. In the same way, the party in power can be rewarded for good service by continuing its chosen representatives in office. These are the alternatives usually presented in Presidential elections.

On November 7th, 1900, the electors of the United States will have quite a different and a vastly more important problem presented for their decision at the polls. The duty of American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

citizens to put patriotism above politics at this time, and to vote for the best interests of the whole country, seems to me to be unusually clear. The considerations leading to this conclusion it ought not to be difficult to state. The situation is an extraordinary one. When a man's house is threatened by fire, he does not stop the firemen to ask if they are members of his lodge, or whether they entertain the same views as he does about the tariff or the income tax. In the presence of the graver peril, minor issues are lost sight of. Self-preservation is the first law of nations as well as of individuals.

It is my firm conviction that the vast majority of the voters of the United States will, within a year, have abundant and unmistakable evidence, in their homes, shops, counting-houses and offices, that their decision at the polls this fall gave the United States the greatest impetus it has ever received toward its goal; or, contrariwise, its greatest setback.

For, in the 124 years that have elapsed since the Declaration of Independence, the two parties have never offered the voter so startling a choice. In the face of approaching dissolution, a sick man may contravene the precedents of a long life of well-being and consent to the most critical experiment. But to a healthy man, the suggestion of a desperate and radical departure from all he holds sane and prudent must come as little short of the diabolical.

The American nation is in the hey-day of life and usefulness. It has just passed through a period of four years of absolutely unexampled prosperity. Abroad, it has achieved a place among the Powers of civilization, which surpasses the fondest aspirations a reasonable American could have entertained, when McKinley and Bryan first entered the political lists as antagonists. At home, it has strengthened the confidence of industrious capital and widened the horizon of remunerative labor to a point never before attained. Now, it follows that a vote for McKinley and Roosevelt is not only a vote of confidence in the men who, as the agents of the people, have brought this prosperity about, but it is also a declaration that this, of all others, is no time for dangerous experiments with our national finances—the rock-bottom basis of all our prosperity.

The ship of state is sailing along the high seas, in the sunshine, with the Stars and Stripes floating proudly from her top-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most mast, with all the countries of the world welcoming her to new havens, with McKinley at the helm, after four years of honorable and successful experience. There are no clouds on the horizon, no rocks on the chart, save such as he is best equipped to steer clear of. The Bryanized Democracy is seeking to board the ship of state, at this juncture, with the deliberate intention of running her out of her course, out of the course of the world's commerce, to a quicksand of free silver on a desert island.

The commercial agencies of the world now rate the United States "A1." She pays her debts at home and her debts abroad in the same coin. Her rating is the result of a steadfast adherence to the gold standard, to which the Republican party was significantly committed in the St. Louis Convention in 1896. Any doubts in the minds of reasonable men as to the wisdom of this course, must have been long since resolved. The unqualified adherence of the Republican party to commercial honor and financial integrity has been its greatest achievement since it freed the slaves.

A vote for Bryan is a vote to haul down the gold standard and hoist the white flag; to sail out of the path of international prosperity into the dead waters of isolation; to call down the noblest aspirations of patriotism and to proclaim our country a coward and a shirk in the family of nations!

So much for our obligations to mankind in general. As to our duty to ourselves—our obligations to be honest in our own financial and industrial affairs; to provide for our own people; to continue in our own land the conditions which have enabled us to provide remunerative employment for labor, active and increasing operations for capital, and a general support of and respect for the tribunals of justice—that duty needs only to be stated to stand out to the eyes of all men. The elections in Vermont and Maine show that the citizens of New England abide by their convictions, and favor, as they did four years ago, the unflinching discharge of duties as well as debts. They refused to be frightened by the bogie of Imperialism. They set an example to their fellow-citizens, North, South, East and West. They have heartened the strong and strengthened the weak. I have every confidence that the voters of the United States, now fifteen millions strong, will re-elect President McKinley. And not the least interesting element in this deliberate exercise of the highest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duty and obligation of citizenship will be a disregard of party lines. The best men in the Democratic party realize that the interests of our common country would be seriously imperilled by the election of Bryan.

The cost of a national blunder this fall would be inconceivable. The paralysis of capital, the destruction of wages, the suspension of payments, the cessation of business operations, would, after all, be of minor moment, as compared with the profound discouragement of our national aspirations and the world-wide disgrace of our commercial name.

T. C. PLATT.

IX.

THE PARAMOUNT ISSUE.

THE welfare of the country is paramount in every political contest. No political party can always be right; but one party or the other must be trusted with the reins of government. It is sometimes difficult to determine which party would be likely to govern the country best. In the present contest the Republican party stands for law, order, honor, progress, and good government, while the Democratic party makes loyalty to rebels in arms against the United States the paramount issue. Under these circumstances, it is plain to every patriotic man that duty to our country demands that the Republican party should be continued in power.

Four years ago the silver question was the paramount issue. I believed then, and I believe now, that the demonetization of silver, whether ignorantly or corruptly accomplished, was the greatest calamity of the nineteenth century. It reduced the supply of money and enhanced its value fully one hundred per cent., and the general range of prices fell in twenty years more than fifty per cent. Property invested in bonds and other money futures was doubled, while all other property lost one-half of its exchangeable value. I believed that Mr. Bryan was earnestly in favor of silver, and that he was an honest and sincere man, and I believed that if the Democratic party could gain power on that issue, it would do everything possible to restore the coinage of silver. So strong was my conviction that the good of the country

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

required the mintage of silver equally with gold, that I left the Republican party and labored zealously to elect Mr. Bryan.

But times have changed, and Mr. Bryan has changed. At all events, he has developed characteristics incompatible with patriotism or honor. The contention of the silver men that more money would restore prosperity has been verified. A thousand million dollars of new gold from the mines since 1896, a hundred million dollars added to the bank currency, and the war expenditures have raised prices, furnished employment for all, and created the good times which the remonetization of silver would have produced. The money question will not be considered by the people when money is plentiful, and the advocates of silver must wait until the bounteous flow of gold from the mines is diminished and falling prices come again. The financial issue will then be paramount. Any attempt to make the silver question an issue when money is abundant will not advance the cause, but, on the contrary, will create a prejudice in the minds of the people against the white metal.

Under these circumstances, it was natural for Mr. Bryan to seek some other issue. His success in creating what he terms the "paramount" issue, and forcing the Democratic party to adopt it, is an exhibition of genius and leadership without a parallel in American politics. "Imperialism" is a myth. It does not exist, and it can not exist in this country. Everybody in all parties is opposed to it. No President has ever attempted to maintain a larger army than was necessary to defend the honor of the country and maintain law and order.

No one knows better than Mr. Bryan that there is no real issue of imperialism, because he virtually admits that there would have been no imperialism to fight if he had not secured the ratification of the treaty with Spain, by which we acquired the Philippines. Nearly all of his two hours' speech of acceptance at Indianapolis was devoted to imperialism as growing out of the acquisition of these islands. He even congratulates himself on having secured the ratification of the treaty, and points to the result as justifying the means. He says:

> "I believe that we are now in a better position to wage a successful contest against imperialism than we would have been had the treaty been rejected."

Very true. If the treaty had been rejected, Mr. Bryan's two

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hours' speech against the acquisition of the islands would have been inapplicable, and he might have been unable to discover any other mirage with which to deceive the Democratic convention. The conduct of Mr. Bryan in securing the ratification of the treaty to create the issue of imperialism is crafty, and would be harmless in a person not the candidate of a great party for President of the United States.

The most remarkable part of Mr. Bryan's scheme is his assumption that expansion and imperialism are one and the same thing. The Democratic party is responsible for every foot of expansion previous to the purchase of Alaska by Johnson's administration, and every acre of territory acquired since the adoption of the Constitution has been acquired against the protest and generally against the sanguinary opposition of the inhabitants. The consent of the people has never in any case been given or asked. The few inhabitants of the land embraced in the Louisiana purchase, who knew what was taking place, protested, but the great mass of the people in that territory have continued their opposition in bloody wars for nearly a century, and still regard themselves as independent tribes or nations. The Florida purchase brought on the Seminole war, which lasted seven years. Both Mexicans and Indians occupying Texas, New Mexico, California, and Arizona were bitterly hostile to the change of sovereignty. The language of all cessions to the United States is precisely the same. The Philippines were acquired, so far as manner, form and substance are concerned, just as all other territory has been acquired by the United States.

Mr. Bryan's contention that the acquisition of the Philippines is imperialism stamps Presidents Jefferson, Monroe, Jackson, Polk, and Pierce as imperialists, and makes the establishment of free institutions and the erection of great states in newly acquired territory the very essence of imperial dominion.

Every act of Mr. McKinley's administration in dealing with the Filipinos has been based upon and modelled after the precedents of the great Democratic Presidents, whom the American people love to honor. The audacity of Mr. Bryan's charge of imperialism against President McKinley for following in the footsteps of Democratic Presidents in the acquisition and government of territories has taken the country by surprise.

If the contention of Mr. Bryan be right, then President Cleve-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land was the only occupant of the White House who was a real anti-imperialist. His refusal to accept Hawaii makes him the only Democratic model worthy of imitation, and distinguishes him as the only true patriot whose administration conformed to the Declaration of Independence. It is unfortunate that the greatest Jeffersonian Democrat who ever occupied the Executive chair should be unable to endorse Mr. Bryan's candidacy for President, with anti-imperialism as the foundation of mutual admiration.

The motives of Mr. Bryan in taking sides with Aguinaldo and his rebellious followers are not as well understood by the Filipinos as they are by our own people. The inhabitants of Luzon do not know that Mr. Bryan invented "imperialism," or that he has taken sides with them against his own Government, solely for the purpose of gaining votes. They do not know that an honest, successful administration and great prosperity are persuasive arguments in favor of the re-election of Mr. McKinley, and that the encouragement which the rebels in the archipelago are receiving from Mr. Bryan is a part of the great drama of legerdemain by which he hopes to hypnotize the American people, and induce them to jump out of the frying pan into the fire.

Mr. Bryan seems utterly heedless of the consequences of the aid and comfort he is extending to rebels in arms. He pays no attention to the accumulation of evidence that the guerilla warfare in Luzon is prolonged in anticipation of immediate independence in case of his election. The shooting of American soldiers and the murder and robbery of natives friendly to the United States, in order to keep up a show of resistance until the Democratic candidate becomes President, count for nothing when weighed in the balance against Mr. Bryan's ambition. I call upon all fair-minded citizens to read Mr. Bryan's speech of acceptance, delivered at Indianapolis on the 8th of August, 1900, and compare his utterances with the statutes of the United States against aiding and encouraging rebellion. It seems to me that section 5,334 of the Revised Statutes is applicable to his case. It is as follows:

"Sec. 5334. Every person who incites, sets on foot, assists, or engages in any rebellion or insurrection against the authority of the United States, or the laws thereof, or gives aid and comfort thereto, shall be punished by imprisonment not more than ten years, or by a fine of not more than ten thousand dollars; or by both of such pun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ishments, and shall, moreover, be incapable of holding any office under the United States."

Mr. Bryan evidently fears that the paramount issue of imperialism which he has created will fade if kept too constantly in the focus of public opinion. His acrobatic qualities are brought into service nearly every day in mounting a new stalking-horse. His recent rough-riding of Trusts puts to shame the cowboys on a thousand hills. He proposes to destroy Trusts by creating a federal trust to control all other trusts. He says:

"Let Congress provide that, whenever any corporation organized in any State wants to do business outside of the State, it must go to the federal government and obtain a license which will enable it to do such outside business."

He does not say to which department of the Government he would assign this duty, but the presumption is that he would organize a Department of Trusts, in which only trusted favorites would be appointed. He says in his letter of acceptance:

"I shall select an attorney general who will without fear or favor enforce existing laws."

He does not say which party passed those laws. The only effective law against Trusts was recommended by President Harrison and passed by a Republican Congress in 1890. This law has been upheld and enforced by the Supreme Court of the United States. Under it, the Supreme Court of the United States held that a traffic agreement between thirty-one different railroad companies was illegal, and the court enjoined its further execution. Judge Taft, in the Circuit Court of Appeals, held, in the case of the Addystone Pipe and Steel Company *vs.* the United States, that a combination between six corporations not to compete with each other was illegal.

What law against Trusts was passed during either the first or the second term of Mr. Cleveland's administration? What efforts were made by Cleveland's Attorneys-General, Garland, Olney or Harmon, to prosecute trusts?

Mr. Bryan, in his Wheeling speech, says:

"I want to destroy every private monopoly in the United States."

Mr. Bryan's election would, therefore, sweep out of existence all patent rights, close the Patent Office, and destroy many other private rights which are of necessity exclusive and, consequently,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monopolies. It would put an end to the marvellous development of the mechanical skill of the American people, which has made the United States conspicuous throughout the world. It would deprive genius of both the incentive to exertion and the means of subsistence, and turn back indefinitely the tide of progress. Mr. Bryan's undigested views, wild assertions, and disastrous remedies for Trusts are undoubtedly the result of want of time to consider thoroughly any one subject, on account of the multiplicity of issues he seeks to utilize in order to be elected President.

In view of the prosperity of the country and the general increase of wages since 1896, the coal miners will naturally inquire whether their grievances result from McKinley's administration or are the work of a New York syndicate of heartless speculators, who miss the bond deals and the plunder of wrecked fortunes which they enjoyed under the Cleveland administration. When they discover, as they must, that the policy of the Administration has created general prosperity, and that extortion and oppression are inspired by private greed, they will not gratify the malice or desire for plunder of their real oppressors; nor will they listen to the cry of "stop thief" from those who rob their dinner pails, although that cry is echoed by the melodious voice of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. Bryan is a great orator, but he can hardly maintain the charge that the Republican party is responsible for all the evils, real and imaginary, that flesh is heir to. The assumption that all monopolies are created by legislation of Congress, and that the President of the United States is responsible for all disagreements and conflicts between employers and employees will not commend itself to sensible men. Mr. Bryan will learn that the American people do not live on hate alone, and that his efforts to array neighbor against neighbor, class against class, and to embitter the masses against the owners of accumulated wealth will not increase, but will diminish, his following.

I believe that a great majority of the people of the United States are beginning to regard Mr. Bryan as an able, adroit, and plausible sophist, possessed of wonderful magnetism and will power, but an unsafe man to be trusted in the high office of President of the United States.

WILLIAM M. STEWART.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

X.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION—OUR DUTY.

Government by party, which seems essential under present conditions, furnishes platforms which usually commend themselves unreservedly to supporters; being made not so much to "stand upon" as to "get in" upon, nothing is proclaimed in them which is likely to offend any section of the party. Points likely to meet with disfavor are either ignored or smothered in meaningless platitudes. But occasions arise when the supporter who regards parties only as means to ends, differs from the official rulers and makers of platforms upon a vital issue, and he is then called upon to consider seriously whether it be of such paramount importance as to make it his duty to refrain from voting, or even to vote against his party. The former course is adopted frequently, the latter rarely; nevertheless it sometimes becomes our duty to go to this extreme.

In the last Presidential campaign the Gold Democrats reached the first stage and refused to vote for the candidate of their party, but did not generally vote for the opposing candidate. A candidate of their own was nominated; but many felt the standard of value to be of such vital importance as to dwarf all other considerations, and, preferring Country to Party, left their party, to support the Republican candidate. Those who did so were certainly actuated by a compelling sense of duty, for the leaving of party by loyal members is equivalent to the breaking up of family relations hitherto harmonious and happy. It is the last resort, only justified when all else has failed. We should labor long and hard for reform within our party before attempting to enforce reform upon it from without, yet it is not among the unswerving supporters of party that a country in times of trial finds its saviours. "My party, right or wrong!" and "My country, right or wrong!" are the cries of those who can never be of the highest value as citizens, or safe guides in a national crisis. On the contrary, these are the most dangerous of all classes to their country's welfare; for parties and States are bound to regard what is right and must be opposed by those whose conscience is awakened to wrongdoing by either. The most precious citizen is the man who will go with his country or his party only if it be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

right, but who upon occasion hesitates not to condemn either when in his opinion it champions the wrong. It is not those who support but those who rebuke the wrong, whether of country or party, who are the salt of a nation, and truly patriotic. History abounds in instances where the voice and action of the few have saved a country, or have so impressed it that it has been deterred from following in a wrong path into which it has strayed. This is particularly true in regard to questions involving Peace or War. Among the axioms of the demagogue, none is considered safer than this: "Show the people 'sport' and they will follow you," the "sport" being the killing of men by men in battle under the name of war. It is so easy to "wave the flag" and carry the excited masses into bloodshed, but how low has the statesman sunk who descends to this! Dr. Johnson said to Boswell that "patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." It is also the sure resort of the demagogue. War is always a winning card for the scheming politician to play when differences arise between nations, because it appeals to the baser part of man, dethrones divine reason, exalts brutal passion, excites the traits man shares with the brute which degrade humanity

Our own country is young and its record, until recently, has been free from the crime of aggressive warfare upon other civilized peoples. The War for Independence was righteous, being in defence of constitutional liberties, which we should ever stand ready to defend. Its triumph benefited both oppressor and oppressed. It is better for Britain and for America that the one should be independent of the other. The War of 1812 was in defence of rights assailed upon the sea, and what the Republic fought for is now established. The War for the Union was equally for the benefit of North and South, of slave and of master. It preserved for all a common country.

It is from Britain, the elder branch of our English-speaking race, that the most valuable lessons are to be derived as to the folly of aggressive wars. The war against the American Colonies is now admitted by all parties in Britain to have been a mistake. The whole campaign against Napoleon, which still loads Britain with her huge national debt, is now seen to have been a mistake also. Under similar conditions, it would not be entered upon today. As to the Crimean War against Russia, Lord Salisbury has recently stated that it was a great blunder. The men most highly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

honored in British history, as having been the true guides who pointed out the path their country should follow and denounced its errors, are Burke and Chatham, who denounced the American War; Bright and Cobden, who denounced the Crimean War; not George the Third and Lord North, nor the Jingoes who howled for the Crimean War against Russia. These now stand in their proper places as false guides, and, if truth be spoken, in many cases as demagogues, who played the card of war simply because that was the issue upon which they could ride to or retain power. The same fate awaits those who have precipitated war against the South African Republics, upon the pretence that they were concerned to make it easier for Britons there to abandon citizenship and become Afrikanders. Not these men, but Campbell-Bannerman, Harcourt, Morley, Courtney, Sir Edward Clarke and their colleagues are soon to be held in esteem, and extolled as the true patriots who protested against the wrong. In due season, also, those of our Republican party who drove the President into war and the purchase of the Philippines, against his own wise desires, will occupy a position similar to that of the British Jingoes. If there be one duty which a man of influence has to perform to his country higher than another, it is to refrain from arousing the passions of the people against other nations and to keep them in the paths of peace. Humanity has travelled far and upward in the ages past, but there still remains in us a sub-stratum of the savage, far too readily moved to draw the sword and kill. He who appeals to this as a means of popularity must despise himself, and in the court of his own conscience stand ever condemned, the most torturing punishment that can fall upon man.

In the present Presidential campaign, many Republicans who, like the writer, voted for the first Republican ticket and never voted any other than a Republican ticket, are called upon to consider the departure of the official leaders of their party from the policy of the Republic, in the purchase and attempted conquest of the Filipinos, with the intention of holding their country as conquered territory and not as part of the Union, with its citizens equal under the flag The Union is to be composed not of one homogeneous whole, the flag is to wave not over citizens possessed of equal rights, but we are to follow the example of the military nations of Europe and endeavor to govern far distant peoples as subjects not citizens, vassals not freemen. No more complete

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reversal of doctrines hitherto held precious by Americans can be conceived. In this attempt, up to last returns, we have already sacrificed 5,467 men killed or wounded, and squandered 186 millions of dollars, no doubt over two hundred millions to date, and constantly increasing, all wrung from the people by additional taxation. We have sent 81,000 soldiers to one of the twelve hundred islands we forced Spain to sell us for twenty millions of dollars, contrary to the instructions first given to the Peace Commissioners. Sixty-three thousand soldiers still remain there, and this force, more than double the entire standing army of the United States until recently, is still required to keep down the people. Hence, sufficient force could not be spared from Manila to rescue our Ambassador at Pekin. One writer states that four thousand of them are in hospital; thus wastes our army away! And we only hold the region around Manila; all else of the 115,000 square miles of the territory we claim to have bought and are vainly hoping to conquer remains, as before, unvisited by our force. This is a serious situation.

The question which the member of the Republican party has to decide at this juncture is, whether this mis-step be sufficient to cause him to refrain from voting for its nominee, or even to vote against him. Before this can be decided, we must consider the alternative and its consequences, for our acts are right or wrong in political life according to the results to be avoided or attained for our country through them. It is to-day a question of weighing differing results against each other and deciding upon which side the balance of good lies.

Let us therefore consider the platforms of the contending parties.

The Republican platform is vague upon the anti-American idea of permanent, conquered, foreign dependencies outside of the Union. It says:

> "Our authority could not be less than our responsibility; and wherever sovereign rights are extended, it becomes the high duty of the government to maintain its authority, to put down armed insurrection, and to confer the blessings of liberty and civilization upon all the rescued peoples. The largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them by law. To Cuba independence and self-government were assured in the same voice by which war was declared, and to the letter this pledge shall be performed."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No serious objection need be urged to this, except that we do not believe that the payment of two dollars per head for ten millions of the Filipinos can give sovereign rights over men, nor that Spain could give clear title against our allies the Filipino patriots, who had risen against her in righteous rebellion for independence. But the important point is that our party here pledges itself anew in its platform to give Cuba independence and self-government, fit work for the party of Freedom. What we should continue to press upon the party is to consider whether it would not be best to promise the Filipinos what we have promised the Cubans. It does not seem good sense to pursue a different policy for them. Admiral Dewey is not the only one who assures us that they are better qualified to govern themselves than the Cubans. What was good and wise policy for the one seems so for the other. We have encouraged "the highest aspirations" of the latter for independence, as President McKinley so finely said. We see here that the true mission of our giant republic lies in the creation and protection of the new republic of Cuba. We should one day, and not long hence, make our country the mother of nations, and regard the Republic of Cuba and the first Republic of the Orient as our noblest work, in line with the emancipation of our slaves. There is nothing in our platform antagonistic to this policy. The Republican party is the only proper agency for this sublime task. The Democratic party has earned no right by virtue of its past record to rob our party of its heritage.

The apologetic note is heard more and more touching the Philippines, which are rapidly proving themselves in every respect undesirable, and few indeed fail to express the wish in private, though their tongues may be silent in public, that the President had adhered to his original instructions to the Peace Commissioners. We shall probably soon return to the true path, welcoming expansion of contiguous territory where we can grow our own race and enrol them as citizens, but refraining from forcing our rule upon others in far distant lands or from ever accepting the idea that the American flag can permanently float over any but citizens possessed of equal rights, members of the one glorious Union, "now and forever indivisible."

Along with the platform, we are bound to consider the Man who is to steer the Ship of State under its provisions. Much depends upon him. What, then, of President McKinley, if his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

official career is to be extended over a second term? What manner of man is he? No one who knows Mr. McKinley and his life can fail to wish for him, as an individual, many long years of unclouded happiness, for every domestic virtue is his. His place as a man is securely fixed in all hearts; but his official place in history, as one who has filled the highest political office upon the earth, we trust is not to be determined by his past, but by his future conduct of affairs; for, were he to retire at the end of his first term, his position must rank low indeed, for he would leave his country still involved in one of the most complete failures of modern times, the attempt to bring forth from his Pandora box, the Philippines, any result other than deplorable—a Sisyphean labor in which success is impossible.

The writer believes that the President, freed from the many embarrassments which hamper all Presidents during their first term, will prove more of a master, and that more of the President and less of his party managers will prove most advantageous for the country. He has been much wiser than others in the party who have shouted loudest. Let it never be forgotten that he was sound upon the question of war, and that his hand was cruelly forced by men far his inferiors in statesmanship. Again, he was entirely right in regard to the Philippines, as his instructions to the Peace Commissioners prove. Here, again, the shouting crowds, backed by political managers, drove him into a reversal of his wise policy. He was right, also, in regard to Porto Rico, but compelled by his political managers to retract, and agree to the present discreditable legislation. The writer has no desire to imply that, in his opinion, the party managers were not right in their view that an extension of our laws to Porto Rico, with the dark shadow of the Philippines behind, would have disrupted our party. He believes that the masses of working-men, both in agriculture and manufacturing, upon whom our party rests, will never agree to the free introduction of the products of tropical possessions; hence the mistake, in his opinion, of our party persisting in the effort to attach the Philippines or merge them into our political system. But Porto Rico being now a part of the Union, merged as a strategic base never to be surrendered, the President was right in holding it to be our plain duty to give it all the rights of Union

Thus, upon all these important issues, the President has shown true statesmanship, and gives foundation for the hope that, during

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his second term, with the people at his back, he will show increased and justifiable confidence in his own conclusions. He would be his own wisest counsellor, if he had a proper estimate of his own remarkable insight and faculty for grasping at once the true bearing of public affairs.

The marked success, thus far, of his management of the dangerous Chinese question, when Congress and party leaders are fortunately scattered, is another case in point. Left to himself, he has succeeded in giving our country a position never before attained in international affairs, and kept our government right when all others were wrong, Russia perhaps excepted, whose views were withheld until recently from public expression. The United States have taken and held the leading position among the co-operating nations from the start, and seem now to be the natural mediator through whom peace is to be restored. A higher honor for the Republic could not be imagined than that she should be the blessed instrument to bring about peace among men.

There is thus abundant reason to hope that President McKinley may yet shape events in such a way as to be able to repeat to the Filipinos his few potent words to the Cubans, promising his aid and protection in establishing a free and independent government, "thus realizing their highest aspirations." These few words would change the entire situation and give him rank with the greatest; for the future would then remember him as the Father, not the Suppressor, of the first Republic of the Orient, which, like the Cuban Republic, would come slowly but steadily forth under his fostering care. Next to Lincoln's emancipation of our own oppressed, this act would rank in the history of his country. Here lies true glory for a patriot to win for the Republic. Some President will win it; but we shall not believe that the prize is not reserved for President McKinley, and for the Republican party, to which such work properly belongs. It was born to emancipate, not to enslave. If it ceases to create Citizens, and creates and rules over Vassals to whom it denies equality in the Union, it deserves to die.

When we study the Democratic platform we find that its Americanism, as opposed to Imperialism, rings true. It stands, as the writer feels, for the true policy, the only policy consistent with the fundamental ideas which gave birth to the Republic, and to which it must hold true or fall from its hitherto proud position

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among the nations of the earth. It is also American in every syllable against militarism, and the huge standing army for which our party is responsible, but which, let us hope, the coming Congress is to reduce. It is right upon Porto Rico, where it occupies the President's first position, and tells the people our "plain duty." It is right in regard to Cuba; but here our party, the writer rejoices to say, is in full accord. It is right, also, in regard to expansion. It is right in condemning the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty as un-American. It is right in regard to the Boers. It is right in regard to the speedy repeal of war taxes, but here again our party is equally so. One of the first acts of the new Congress, both from a party and a national point of view, should be the repeal of many petty, irritating taxes which should never have been imposed.

This being said, all has been said that can be urged in favor of the Democratic ticket. The most serious objection to it is not the proposed lowering of the standard of value, serious though that be. It lies in the insidious attacks upon the Supreme Court, which strike at the foundations of human society. It saps the roots of peace and order, and, if successful, substitutes license for law, and throws us back to barbarism, even to savagery. Without courts of law and profound reverence for their final decisions, which should be considered as sacred, we have nothing, for it is upon these that civilization rests. President McKinley at present stands for war and violence abroad, but Mr. Bryan stands for these scourges at home. Whatever Democrats may urge in explanation, or as to the literal meaning of the words employed, the fact remains that an attack is made in the platform of a political party upon a decision of the Supreme Court, the highest and grandest of all human tribunals the world has ever seen, and which, being undermined, there remains only civil disorder. It is not possible to support a party whose platform contains such an attack; better, far better, continue for a time the wrongful effort to force our government upon the Filipinos, in total disregard of Republican ideas, than fail to repel this covert attack upon the reign of law at home.

The Silver Issue, as a question for discussion, is a "back number." The only argument against the highest standard of value which had plausibility was the quantitative theory, which would be right if gold and silver were used for exchanges. But it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

groundless from the simple fact that for only five per cent. of exchanges are the metals used; to the extent of ninety-five per cent. they are transacted upon credit, and it is this vast fabric of credit, upon which the business of the world rests, that the threatened change of the standard of value would throw into confusion. The trifling five per cent. for which the metals are used need scarcely be taken into account. Since the supply of gold has been and is being so surprisingly augmented at a ratio ever increasing, Mr. Bryan is too late, for the question is no longer the scarcity of gold, but rather its threatened superabundance, as far as the stability of the standard is concerned, according to the quantitative theory, upon which Mr. Bryan has hitherto stood. Not a voice is heard any longer in any other part of the world against the gold standard. When the Democratic platform talks of international bimetallism, it harks back to a bygone delusion which all other nations have discarded. Fiat money is now the only lure that can hereafter be tried with any hope of winning votes; the monetization of silver having been discussed, decided, and laughed out of court throughout the world. Nevertheless, we cannot disguise the fact that the election of Mr. Bryan would undoubtedly cause apprehension to the timid, and a few timid men suffice to make a panic; for there is no chord more sensitive than the credit upon which ninety-five per cent. of all business rests. Mr. Bryan as President, with a Secretary of the Treasury of like views, might resolve to pay in silver as being coin—a course which would bring financial panic in every channel of business in an hour. In saying this, we pay Mr. Bryan the deserved compliment of recognizing that he has convictions, and that the danger of panic and all the suffering it entails to the toiling masses, who are ever the worst sufferers, is in exact proportion to the faith his countrymen have in his honesty and fidelity to principle. We all fear, and have a right to fear, that with a reputation for devotion to principle akin to that earned by Lincoln, Mr. Bryan would support and try to enforce his convictions. This means a President, with all the influence a President has in Senate and House, which is generally potent, determined by every means in his power to throw the exchanges of the country into chaos. We cannot be a party to aid his elevation to power, strongly as we approve his true Americanism as far as Imperialism goes, or deeply as his character and ability have impressed us. An earnest, honest man in the wrong

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is more to be dreaded than the average politician, who changes with the wind. Mr. Bryan is much too earnest, too sincere and true to be entrusted with power, filled as he is with ideas subversive of economic laws, and of the laws upon which our complex human society rests.

The Democratic platform favors an income tax, which Mr. Gladstone declared "tended to make a nation of liars." So deeply impressed was he with its injurious effects upon the national character that he resolved to repeal it. That a true American can favor the miserable espionage required to enforce it is surprising. Nothing would be more un-American than to subject every man's business and financial affairs to the scrutiny of government officials, who would be in many cases affiliated with rival concerns or possible competitors in the future. The tax was cheerfully borne for some years during the War for the Union, and would be again under similar circumstances, although it would be a grave mistake to resort to it. The tariff is a far better instrument for assessing the rich, more effective, and free from objectionable espionage. The writer believes in collecting the revenues, as far as possible, from the rich, and favors heavy death taxes upon estates in lieu of income tax. There is no reason why the necessary expenditures of the government should not come chiefly from this class through such taxes, and through the tariff. When we tire of our Philippine policy—as we shall ere long—and reduce our army to its normal number, sufficient revenue will be easily secured. Costly foreign wines, tobacco, laces, silks, linens, broadcloth, and the thousand and one luxuries we import, should be made to pay excessively high duties. Domestic products are used by the masses; and those Americans who indulge in foreign articles, which are really luxuries, should be made to pay for their fastidious tastes as a matter of revenue. To tax foreign luxuries heavily and to collect a high percentage of death duties upon estates should be the policy, instead of exposing every man's business affairs and giving the dishonest the advantage over the honest, as all experience shows an income tax does, and must do in the nature of things.

Besides this, an income tax involves the creation of an enormous staff of permanent officials, who have in their keeping a knowledge of the private affairs of their fellow-citizens, dangerous to all. Even if these officials were appointed, as in Britain, sub-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stantially for life, the tax would soon be found intolerable in a new land like ours, free from a distinct and permanent official class unconnected with business affairs and leading lives as members of a profession apart from the people in general. We have in Mr. Bryan an extraordinary man—a typical American, as President McKinley himself is, a product that only American soil can grow—a man of the people in every fibre, like McKinley and Lincoln; but his career shows that the theoretical and superficial views of affairs still captivate him. He seems not to have studied down to the root of things, and he has yet to learn how often the theoretical and practical effects of legislation differ. In theory there is no tax fairer than that upon income, in practice none so injurious to a nation.

Again, we must believe that had he duly considered the effect of dragging the judicial decisions of our final Court of Appeal into the arena of party politics, he could not have sanctioned so flagrant a violation of the theory upon which our Constitution rests, which is that, over and above the Legislative and Executive, which constitute the Political Department, there sits the final and supreme Arbiter, the Judicial, in the calm atmosphere of Law, removed from the passion and violence of party, unmoved by political change, settling all disputes finally, and thus decreeing and enforcing peace among all persons and all parties, and even among the States themselves. In this Tribunal rests our assurance of continued peaceful development. The party which drags its judgments into a political campaign should be defeated. We should reverence above all other institutions the Supreme Court; it is so distinctively American, and is perhaps the most precious, as it is the most original, of all the features of that perfect work, the American Constitution. The elevation of the Judicial above the Political is almost unknown, and is wholly so among English speaking people, save with us; with all others the Political Parliament is supreme. There is thus nothing more American than the Supreme Court. Mr. Bryan's Americanism is sound only so far as Imperialism goes. Upon the Income Tax, and—infinitely more serious—upon the Supreme Court, the ark of our national covenant, he is no more American than President McKinley is at present upon his own truly American doctrines of "Criminal Aggression" and "plain duty."

We find many dangers ahead in Mr. Bryan's success. First:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that of License instead of Law at home, in our very midst, through political denunciation of judicial decisions. Second: not Gold and Silver, but Silver alone, since an inferior drives out a superior currency. This means defrauding Labor to the extent of one-half of its earnings under the gold standard, and the loss to the people of one-half of their savings in Banks, since these savings, which are now repayable in gold, would then be repaid in silver. Third: a Tax upon the Incomes of citizens, inaugurating an un-American system of espionage demoralizing to the national character.

We find against President McKinley's success a threatened continuance of the costly and unsuccessful attempt to suppress the laudable aspirations of the Filipinos for the independence of their country, in accordance with the American idea of the rights of man, which he has promised the Cubans, and for which Franklin, Hamilton, Jefferson, Adams, and the fathers of our country rebelled and Washington drew the sword. Mr. Bryan would bring upon his countrymen all the evils of civil strife at home, by undermining our courts of law. President McKinley's policy only requires our soldiers to shoot down men abroad guilty of the crime of fighting and dying for their country's independence. Class once arrayed against class at home, all is lost; restoration of peace and order could only come in a far distant future; whereas the employment of our forces in suppressing Filipinos abroad must be a matter of to-day only, for it is incredible that the people will tolerate this waste of men and money much longer. The writer believes that the end of it is near; but, even if he were mistaken, and it were left for the Opposition at a subsequent election to drive his party from power in Congress and restore the true policy by refusing to maintain the present huge standing army necessary for the purpose, he sees clearly and beyond doubt that his duty as a citizen is to support the nominee of the Republican party in the present contest, as being that party which alone can preserve the country from threatened dangers at home, so serious as to overshadow all other issues, and also as the party which will, in the future as in the past, administer the government for the highest and best interests of the Republic.

The Party of Protection of American Industries, of Internal Improvements, the Party of the Union, of Emancipation, and of the Highest Standard of Value for the money of the people, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Party of Cuba Free and Independent, is not to be deserted for its failure so far to perform this same sacred duty to the Philippines. On the contrary, the party which has been for a generation the guardian of our country, and whose wise legislation has secured its present commanding position, may wisely be trusted to find the lost path and return to it, thus retrieving its error.

This the writer believes is to be the certain and not remote result, and for that end he shall continue to exert whatever influence he may possess or acquire, within, not without, the party for which he cast his first vote and for which he hopes to cast his last, and in this he is proud to follow Ex-Speaker Reed, Senators Hoar, Hale, Mason, ex-Senator Edmunds and others, statesmen eminent alike for party and personal service and for personal character. ANDREW CARNEGIE.

XI.

WHAT OUGHT A GOLD DEMOCRAT TO DO?

THE unenviable position in which the Democratic party was left, after the adoption of the platform and the nomination of Mr. Bryan as a Presidential candidate four years ago, made inevitable the withdrawal from affiliation with the organization as newly constituted, of a very large number of men who, until then, had been not only believers in the principles of the party, but staunch supporters of its candidates. They refused their support from neither political pique nor thwarted personal ambition, but wholly because they saw in the new order of things, proclaimed under the guise of Democracy, a perversion of all those teachings and practices for which the Democratic party had stood in the past. To them, the candidacy of Mr. Bryan for the executive office was not that of a Democrat, but of one who had nothing in common with the principles of the party. The movement to stand for something Democratic, which found its origin among a few men before the Chicago Convention adjourned, its development at Indianapolis, and its fruition in the defeat of Mr. Bryan at the polls, was a movement for conscience sake, and in the true order of things it ought not to end until Democracy and Bryanism are not thought of as synonymous terms, and the difference between them has become so clear that "he who runs may read."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Democrats who stood sponsor for the protest against the Bryanized Democracy of 1896 did so both for the good of their country and the betterment of their party. They knew that in serving the best interests of the former they could best serve those of the latter. The great majority of them had been Democrats always, making up in a large measure the membership of the directing force of the organization, and contributing the means of carrying on its campaigns. In refusing to indorse the vagaries of the Chicago platform and the candidate standing upon it, they did not become Republicans, nor accept as political truth Republican doctrines, nor approve of Republican candidates. They had in mind always that the first essential necessity, in saving the Democratic party, was the complete rout of those who had made it not only a reproach and a by-word, but an agency for evil to the best interests of the country.

In accepting Republican candidates now, they assume no other attitude than that which they took in the first instance. They justify their course now as they did then, believing that their highest duty, as citizens as well as party men, makes any other action impossible. They have not gone into, nor do they intend to go into, the Republican party, because they cannot reconcile themselves to the tenets of that party, which stand in direct opposition to principles which they have long held to be essential to a true and safe system of governmental control. Many of them then supported and voted for President McKinley, in spite of an antagonism to a large number of things for which he had stood in the past, because they felt that there were elements of conservatism in the organization and following of his party which could minimize the harmful force of the things to which they objected, on the one hand, and maximize those of which they approved, on the other. Undoubtedly, some of the men who aided in the Gold-Democratic movement of the last Presidential campaign have been disappointed in the President and his party in both directions; but I believe an unbiased consideration of all that has been done by the Administration, taken by and large, will lead to the conclusion that their effort in that behalf was at least worth while, and that much has been accomplished of great benefit to the country in many of its varied and important interests. It has been successful at least in establishing the gold standard through enacted law, and in refunding much of the public debt.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has maintained the public credit and accomplished something toward the improvement of the country's banking law. If it has not gone as far in this direction as the friends of better banking facilities wish, it at least gives promise of taking no backward step. If the country has not been fully satisfied with its administration of foreign affairs, that fact is not a new one in the history of administrations. The conduct of the State Department, acting in conjunction with that of the Executive, is always a subject of general criticism on the part of the political organization out of power. Things are never just right, so far as the public is concerned, for the reason that the very nature of the conduct of state affairs precludes the taking of the public into full confidence. And yet it can be truthfully said that the foreign affairs of each Administration have shown in their conduct much of wisdom and great patriotism. The Administration has been severely criticised more than once for many things growing out of the Spanish-American war, but the war was one for which all political parties in the country stand responsible, and for the consequences of which none is more to blame than the Democratic Presidential candidate himself. He urged his party into it, entered the ranks of the soldiery himself and when it was over made himself largely responsible for the ratifying of the Treaty of Peace which brought the Philippine Islands into our possession, with all the attendant troubles which have followed them.

The extravagances of which complaint is made in the matter of governmental expenditures have been the extravagances which too frequently accompany the carrying on of war. It is to be doubted, however, whether under the same circumstances Mr. Bryan and those who are associated with him would have made a record meriting greater approval. The spirit of militarism pointed to by the opponents of imperialism grew in large measure out of the war which the two great political parties vied with one another in bringing on, and to which Mr. Bryan went as a commissioned officer. There is nothing, in either past or present events, to create a fear that the people of this country, even though the standing army has been enlarged and new military undertakings have been entered upon, will ever either jeopardize its liberties or encroach upon them by such a departure. Militarism may bring extravagances and cause demoralization among those who become actively identified with army life in foreign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fields; but it is beyond the range of possibilities that such a thirst for military glory and power can be fostered among those intrusted with the control of the army as to cause them to make an assault upon the people's rights for personal aggrandizement.

Unfortunately for the country, and doubly unfortunately for the Democratic party, neither is rid of Mr. Bryan and his advocacy of the pernicious doctrine of which he is the leading champion. We are in the midst of another campaign, with a great number of Democrats again placed under the embarrassment of having to choose between an emasculated and tainted Democracy and a distasteful Republicanism. There is no middle ground, nor can any course be pursued by the independent Democrat or Republican other than to support Republican candidates, until the things which have made Mr. Bryan a possible factor in American public life are completely eradicated. It will not do simply to scotch his doctrines at each recurring election. They must be killed, and the country must be rid of teachings that are a disturbing element in its social and political life. The question which confronted Democrats after the action of the party's representatives at Chicago four years ago comes to them now only with greater emphasis, since the gathering at Kansas City. The ailment which then bade fair to be but a passing spasm now seems to have taken on the virulence and distressing evil of a deep-seated disease. If heroic measures seemed requisite then, they are more so now, if any vestige of Democratic principles worth the saving is to be preserved as an element of good to the people in the administration of the country's affairs. The answer to the question as to what a Democrat ought to do, in the light of the circumstances which surround his party, is not difficult to render. He ought to exert himself to defeat Mr. Bryan, and make impossible thereby a future Populistic Presidential candidate and Populistic platform, masquerading under a Democratic party name. The salvation of the Democratic party lies wholly in such a course. Any other course means a continuance in control of those who have wrought loss, dishonor and disorganization to it. The principles of the party, stricken nigh unto death by Altgeld, Tillman and Weaver in 1896, have not been restored to their former virtuous vigor by these same men in 1900, and they can never be. The thoughtful Democrat, who will have regard to an analysis of his party's condition as it is, under the manipula-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of Mr. Bryan and his friends, will see nothing either in it or the condition of the country which warrants him in now sanctioning the things which were repugnant to his sense of public good and party loyalty four years ago. I cannot conceive of any lapse of time sufficiently great to make either economically or morally sound the vicious heresies announced as the embodiment of Democratic principles at the time of Mr. Bryan's first nomination, and reaffirmed in subservience to his dictation when he is now again presented to the country's electorate. The possibility of such a thing ranks with that never accomplished effort of the alchemist to transmute the basest into the finest of metals. Such a change cannot be brought about until a point is reached in the world's history when disapproval of the enforcement of law, repudiation of the sacred right of public and private contract and the non-integrity of courts of justice are recognized as the cardinal principles in a properly adjusted system of governmental economy.

The actions of the Democratic party, without Mr. Bryan and his isms, despite its lapses at times, throughout a long number of years, made for the country's good. It had been a generous contributor to the list of great names which have added lustre to the nation's history. Since the advent of Mr. Bryan as a leader, however, all this has changed, and the Democratic party has become the open advocate of discontent, strife and class prejudice. Its leaders to-day are men ill-acquainted with political history, and strangers to a serious effort to ascertain the origin and basis of economic truth. They are mere declaimers, who, taking their cue from their accepted leader, have produced nothing from their superficial familiarity with the writers of political economy but rhetoric, none of which stands the test of analysis. It is due to the country that, once for all, it be rid of such leaders of political factions and proponents of unwholesome ideas. The hope which Democrats indulge that, somehow and in some way, the party can outgrow Mr. Bryan and still tolerate his leadership is wholly illusive. Mr. Bryan and his views and the Democratic organization and its platform are interchangeable terms, as long as there is not direct and unequivocal repudiation of both by Democrats who have a care for their party's future. The same treatment must be accorded to Mr. Bryan, in a political sense, as was applied in a physical way by one of the early rulers of Persia to an unjust judge. This ruler flayed the despoiler and placed his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

skin over the chair of justice which he once occupied, so that every one who should sit therein in future might take warning from the fate of his iniquitous predecessor—a circumstance that led one of the great Bishops of England, centuries later, to declare in that country of certain leaders who wronged the people that "it will never be merry in England until we have the skins of such." So, too, it will never be merry in the Democratic party until we have the political skins of such as Mr. Bryan, to place in the seats of Democratic leadership, as a warning to all who, to advance the ends of personal ambition, willingly despoil the history, principles, traditions and standing of a great political party.

As long as Mr. Bryan leads Democracy, it is hopelessly wedded to a money standard which means repudiation of the nation's obligations and the impairment of the nation's credit, if once it should be powerful enough to accomplish such a result. It will not do to lull ourselves into a supposed security from danger on this score because Mr. Bryan has seen fit to cease talking on the money question. The people must not flatter themselves that Mr. Bryan has changed his views on this subject. He has not, and he will not. His erroneous views are fixed. He has only found it politic for the present to conceal them, and Mr. Bryan is nothing, if not politic in his demagogy. He was the strenuous advocate of silver until he had gotten through with the Populist and Silver Conventions; but, once they were over, the advocacy of something else being necessary to bring votes and support, silver is made to give way to the issues of anti-imperialism and so-called "anti-militarism." When it is once realized that Mr. Bryan is not a statesman but a charlatan and demagogue, who loves public applause and servile flattery, he will stand stripped of many of his supposed Spartan virtues. His craving is always for notoriety, and there is no means that is at hand that he will not avail himself of. He has never read beyond the elementary in his study of political economy; and, as a result, the consistency of his statements, one with the other, does not concern him. He is equally indifferent to the contradiction, by the course of events, of assertions which he has made and predictions which he has put forth.

It is urged that he is intellectually honest. The acceptance of this statement as truth by one who follows Mr. Bryan from day to day, in all his thousands of words, requires unbounded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assurance as to either the simplicity of his nature or the density of his ignorance. Mr. Bryan has been regarded by many as belonging in sympathy to what is termed the common people. That is a false view. He has led too many of the common people into grievous error by the sophistry and eloquence of his speech, and that, too, for his own political advantage and not to their advancement as a class. The establishment of any close bond of union between the workmen of the country and their employers would mean the loss to Mr. Bryan of every vestige of the support of the workmen, and, therefore, we find him continually a sower of strife between capital and labor. Any considerable exhibition of fraternity of feeling between this and other nations, sanctioned by general consent, would deprive him of another means of appealing to prejudice, and always we find him scouting such relations with other peoples. He inveighs against everything that is, and applauds something which might be, always having in view the bringing to himself the benefit which might accrue in a political struggle from a situation based on discontent and a desire for change.

I do not believe such a man can make a safe Chief Executive of a nation whose population is as varied as is that of the United States. We have here elements which, under a careful, thoughtful and intelligent leadership, always can be depended upon to stand for conservatism, but which, once guided by a leader who depends for his following wholly upon the gifts of oratory and flattery, with whom political expediency is political duty, become elements of danger. The country may, at times, doubt the entire sincerity of a leader who is so frank as to confound frankness itself, and it may to-day well doubt Mr. Bryan. The friends of the Democratic Presidential candidate are wont to excuse him on the ground that, once intrusted with power, he would find the conserving influence of the great office to which he aspires sufficient to restrain him from undertaking to enforce the radical theory which he advocates. There is, undoubtedly, a conserving force in the responsibility of office, which would cause a man of ordinary thought and action to hesitate from pressing measures that might cause great disaster. But Mr. Bryan is not of this class. He is not a man who thinks deeply or who acts wisely. He is always radical, and a careful investigation of his utterances, both in public and private, would reveal that element as the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

predominant characteristic of his nature. It is as noticeable in his most carefully prepared addresses as it is in his extemporaneous ones. He has no intimates but the radicals of his own party, and even they are not on such terms with him as are the leaders of the Populists and Silver Republicans. It would be impossible for him as President to construct a Cabinet made up of men of temperate views on any public question. Any Cabinet which he would form would be as much of a menace as Mr. Bryan himself, because the only difference in views between them would be in degree of radicalism and not in principle. Heretofore, Democracy has sometimes affiliated with other political organizations, but it has never before lost its identity. It has swallowed them, but Mr. Bryan, reversing this order of things, has aided and abetted the conspiracy which aims to have Democracy absorbed by the Populists and Socialists. Whatever isms have found lodgment in the party have been controlled in the past, but this is not now the case. They control the Democratic party entirely, with the full approval of its candidate. Many rallying cries are put forth to disguise their meaning and purpose; but, back of them all, when they stand revealed in their full nakedness, is a socialism which is at war with property interests, great and small.

It is because of this fact, shown in many ways, that all business elements, of every character, importance or location, are against Mr. Bryan and the party which he leads. They do not wish to evade any legal responsibility, to pay less than their just proportion of taxes, to treat unjustly their employees or to deal unfairly with the public. They want only stability in money, equity in law, and wisdom of word and action in the Executive. They distrust Mr. Bryan, because he has made it impossible for them to trust him through his advocacy of things which their business knowledge and experience have proven to them would be disastrous, if once they were enforced. They distrust him not because he is a Democrat, but because he is not one. They know that Democratic principles, rightly interpreted and enforced, are productive of good. So, too, they know equally well that Socialistic doctrines, presented and incorporated into governmental affairs by a demogogue intrusted with power, could not but work out widespread loss and ruin. If Mr. Bryan, then, is not a Democrat but a Populist, why should any Democrat aid in his election? That he was named by the machinery of the party, so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long as that machinery was used simply to ratify the action of another convention and the principles of another party, means nothing. What possible good can come to the country by having Democracy, as now constituted and controlled, intrusted with power? What reform could it inaugurate and carry to a successful issue? It is impossible, in the very nature of its present organization, that Democracy could accomplish any remedial legislation that would benefit the people. On the other hand, it would, by its attempt to give the force of enacted law to the isms to which it is pledged, breed constant uncertainty and distrust. By the pronouncement of its own platform, it is against the gold standard and in favor of the silver one. It would, if given the power, abrogate the right of private contract, and thereby put a premium on dishonesty and evasion of just obligations. It does not believe in the enforcement of order by the lawfully constituted authorities, as against the will of mob law, if it speaks its true beliefs in its party preachment. It is against the country's courts of justice and the majesty of law, as that majesty finds expression in the Supreme Court, according to a platform once announced and many times reaffirmed. It has no use for a civil service which takes from the party worker the spoils of office, despite the fact that it gives to the tax-paying public a better return for the wage which the public provides. It means nothing on the question of a wisely adjusted tariff system, because it is swallowed up in the heresy of protection through its free silver doctrine. It has no force and effect when it speaks on the subject of class legislation, for Populism and Silver have made it wholly a party of special interest, promising each, through the "be it enacted" of legislation, special relief and privileges. Its denunciation of Trusts is a sham, branded so by placing the Trust-supporting and Trust-supported leaders of Tammany high in Democratic councils. In short, Mr. Bryan has brought the Democratic party to that unhappy condition where it can work injury to all and good to none.

As against all this, it is urged that Gold Democrats ought to support Mr. Bryan, because he does not believe in what is known as imperialism and militarism. There is nothing relative to the conduct of our colonial possessions that Mr. Bryan can possibly do within reason, that President McKinley will not do. The statement that Mr. Bryan makes that he will at once, if elected

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President, convene Congress to create a stable government for the Philippines and establish a Monroe doctrine protectorate over them, is wholly idle. He knows that it is impossible to do so, until conditions as to education, guarantee of property rights and as to safety of personal rights, warrant such action. However many the blunders made which wrought the condition that now presents itself, the country is not willing, off-hand and unpreparedly, to set adrift—though retaining a full protecting responsibility for their acts—any peoples who have come to us through the Spanish war. Mr. Bryan misjudges popular sentiment if he thinks that, upon such an issue, he can blind the electors to those things which, affecting our own country, are more paramount than any involved in the issue he is now attempting to create.

The Democrat who really wishes to serve his country best will serve it and his party by voting for President McKinley's re-election. He will not do so as a Republican advocate of Republican principles, but as a Democratic protestor against Bryanistic heresies. There is no half-way house, nor is any good to be accomplished by refraining from voting. It is a case where the surgeon must cut, and cut deeply. When Mr. Bryan is driven from power the patriotic Democrat can go back into a full fellowship with his party; for, when that time comes, the Democratic party will stand for something with the advocacy of which the patriotic Democrat will be glad to be associated. As long, however, as the present status is maintained, he can have neither part nor lot with those who map out the policies of the Democratic party and control its acts.

JAMES H. ECKELS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BUDDHISM.

BY T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, LL.D., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF PALI AND BUDDHIST LITERATURE IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON.

THE contrast between the rapidity with which Buddhism, in the early centuries of its history, spread over all adjoining lands, and its apparent inertness in these later centuries is very striking. We are only just beginning to gather the facts as to its original progress. And modern Buddhists are not in the habit of making any parade of their intentions, or even of their hopes. Any attempt, therefore, to explain this contrast, or to form a judgment as to whether it is likely, or not, to be permanent is beset with difficulty, and must be subject to revision.

It will not be without interest, however, to state shortly what is at present known on the matter, and to refer to some of those points which will be important, or at least suggestive, in any ultimate decision.

There are, of course, no statistics available as to the number of the adherents of the reforming movement in the early days of Buddhism. But the ground had been well prepared. Gotama, the Buddha, was careful in all his discourses to build on foundations already laid. He not only claimed to be, but in fact was, for the most part, a teacher who took up and emphasized the best teaching of the past. On certain points only were his doctrines new. The most important and far reaching of these points was his ignoring the then universally accepted theory of a soul; that is, of a vague and subtle, but real and material, entity supposed to reside during life within the body, and to fly out, at death, usually through a hole at the top of the head, to continue its existence, as a separate and conscious individual, elsewhere. We know for certain that this position, the refusal to use this hypothesis, was, among Indian thinkers, peculiar to Buddhism.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On other points we must still be content to reserve our judgment. The Buddha, for instance, is sometimes said to have abolished caste. But we are entirely unwarranted in supposing the system we now call the caste system to have existed in its present form when Buddha arose, in the sixth century before Christ, in the valley of the Ganges. On the contrary, the keystone of the arch of the peculiarly Indian caste organization—the absolute supremacy of the Brahmins—had not yet been put in position, had not, in fact, been made ready. And in many other details the caste system did not yet exist. It was only in process of evolution. In face of these conditions, the Buddha's doctrine was necessarily two-fold. Within his own order, over which alone he had complete control, he ignored completely and absolutely all advantages or disadvantages arising from birth, occupation, or social status, and swept away all barriers and disabilities arising from the arbitrary rules of mere ceremonial or social impurity. Now, we know there had existed orders before Gotama founded his. But their records are at present available only in so fragmentary a state that we do not yet know whether any of them had taken a similar step before.

On the other hand, outside his own order, the Buddha adopted, as regards what we may now fairly call "questions of caste," the only course then open to any man of sense—that is to say, he strove to influence public opinion (on which such observances depend) by a constant inculcation of reasonable views. Thus, in the Amagandha Sutta it is laid down, in eloquent words, that defilement does not come from eating this or that, prepared or given by this or that person, but from folly in deed or word or thought. And here the very document itself, in giving the doctrine, gives it as the word of an Awakened One (a Buddha) of old. In other words, the Buddhist records put forward this view as having been enunciated long before, with the intended implication that it was common ground to the wise.

This is only one example out of many. The Buddhist doctrines that salvation from suffering, from mere quantitative existence indefinitely prolonged, depended on the choice of a right ideal; that goodness was a function of intelligence; that the sacrifice of the heart was better than a sacrifice of bullocks; that the ideal of man was to be sought, not in birth or wealth or rank, but in wisdom and goodness; that the habitual practice of the rap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ture of deep reverie was a useful means of ethical training, of acquiring that intellectual insight on which self culture depends; a great part of the theory of the origin of evil; a great part of the theory of Karma; the fundamental doctrine of the impermanency of all phenomena; the spirit of unquestioning toleration in all matters of religion and speculation—all these, and others besides, were pre-Buddhistic, and were widely held when Buddhism arose. Even the doctrine that salvation can be obtained in this life was pre-Buddhistic. The Buddha merely added that it could only be enjoyed in this life, that there was no salvation at all beyond the grave.

There was no organized church to attack. It was taken as granted, indeed, that the knowledge of the magic, the mystery, of sacrifice was confined to Brahmins, but the majority of the Brahmins, then as now, followed other pursuits. They were land-owners, officials, even traders. Many of them openly adopted, more of them were in favor of, the new school. And the new school itself was no organized body. No one, unless he actually became a member of Gotama's order, as a considerable number of Brahmins actually did, had to make any break in his life, had to lose any social consideration, by following, in whole or in part, the party of reform.

The economic conditions were peculiarly favorable. And there was present a factor almost indispensable to any new movement of religious reform—the existence side by side of widely differing views of life. Just as our Reformation in Europe was largely due to the influence on Christian minds of the newly discovered pagan literature of Greece, so in India, in the sixth century before Christ, the Aryans were in contact with views of life fundamentally different from their own. It is a great mistake to imagine that the invading Aryans found only savages in the land. The Dravidian civilization was not inferior to, though it was, no doubt, in many respects, different from that of the Aryans themselves. There was probably never a time in the history of the world, either before or since, when so large a proportion of all classes of the people over so extensive a country were possessed by so earnest a spirit of inquiry, of speculation, of interest in religious questions, by so impartial and deep a respect for all who posed as teachers of the truth. And there is no doubt about the enthusiasm of the new converts, though it was an enthusiasm of a pe-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

culiar kind. Almost all were filled with an overpowering reverence and love for their great teacher. Many had experienced, and would never forget, the bliss, the rapture of the moments of insight, of emancipation, of elevation when they realized, in their systematic practice of the reveries of Jhâna, the impermanence of all phenomena. The related episodes reveal a calm confidence arising from the sense of self-mastery won, a keen intellectual pleasure in what seemed to them to be a final solution of the deepest problems of life, a longing sympathy with those blinded by folly and error. And the last of these feelings they were wont to cultivate especially by one of their systematic meditations.

Such are some of the considerations that help us to understand the original spread of Buddhism. Those who have found it difficult to reconcile the undoubted fact of that spread with their view of Buddhism as the apotheosis of annihilation, meaning thereby the annihilation of the soul, are wrong only in the latter half of their contention. As is now well known Nirvana does not mean the annihilation of the soul—the Buddhists did not accept the hypothesis of a soul—but the dying out, in the heart, of the three fell fires of lust, ill-will and delusion. A doctrine of salvation to be gained, and gained now, by self-mastery, by a gradual inward perfection, may have been very different from modern Western ideas, but was quite compatible with the necessary enthusiasm, and appealed strongly to the aspirations of the day.

What we know is that the success of the new doctrine was, in the first centuries, sufficiently marked. Its extent may be gauged by the account of the formal sending forth of missionaries at the close of Asoka's Council, held at Patna in the third century before Christ. They were sent to Sind, to Afghanistan, to Kashmir, to Tibet and Nepal, to the coasts of Burma, to the Dekkan, to Ceylon. In other words missionaries were no longer needed in the vast extent of territory from the Indus to the Gulf of Bengal, from the Himalayas to the Godavari River. And in the following centuries Buddhism had spread west to the Oxus, north to Mongolia, east to China, Korea and Japan, and south to Siam and to Java and to other islands of the far Southeastern Archipelago.

Then came the decline. Outside India, no further progress was made. In India itself the force of the new movement gradually fell away, until Buddhism, like Christianity, became almost unknown, even in the very land of its birth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What were the reasons for this? Chiefly, no doubt, of two kinds—internal weakness and a notable increase in the power of opposing conditions. The very event which, in the eyes of the world, seemed to be the most striking proof of the success of the reforming party, the conversion and strenuous support of Asoka, the most powerful ruler India had had—indeed the first real over-lord over practically the whole of India proper—was only the beginning of the end. The adhesion of large numbers of only nominal converts produced weakness rather than strength. The day of compromise had come. Every relaxation of the old thorough-going position was heartily welcomed and widely supported by converts only half converted. The margin of difference between the Buddhists and their most formidable opponents faded gradually, almost entirely, away. The soul-theory, step by step, regained the upper hand. Caste distinctions were, little by little, built up into a completely organized system. The social supremacy of the Brahmins by birth became accepted everywhere as an incontrovertible fact. But the flood of popular superstition which overwhelmed the Buddhist movement overwhelmed also the whole pantheon of the Vedic Gods. Buddhism and Brahminism practically gave place to modern Hinduism.

We ought not, in fact, to be surprised that a theory which placed the ideal in self-conquest; regarded final salvation as obtainable in this world only, and only by self-culture; a view of life that ignored the "soul," and brought the very gods under the domain of law; a religion which aimed its keenest shafts against just those forms of belief in the supernatural that appeal most strongly alike to the hopes and the fears of the people; a philosophy based on experience, confining itself to going back, step by step, from effect to cause, and pouring scorn on speculations as to the ultimate origin, or end of things—we ought not to be surprised that such a system stumbled and fell. It might gain, by the powerful personality of its founders, by the first enthusiasm, the zeal and the intelligence of his followers, a certain measure of temporary success. But it fought against too many vested interests at once, it raised up too many enemies, it tried, in "pouring new wine into old bottles," to retain too much of the ancient phraseology for lasting success. It was before its time. The end was inevitable. And the end was brought about, not by persecution, but by the gradual weakening of the theory itself, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gradual creeping back under new forms and new names of the more popular beliefs.

In almost the words the present writer ventured to use, nearly twenty years ago, "It would be, perhaps, hard to find, in the whole history of the world, a greater tragedy than that typified by the feast of Juggernauth. The number of deaths at the festival has doubtless been sometimes exaggerated, and I am quite aware that reasons can be given for the character of the carvings on the triumphal car of Vishnu. But it is acknowledged that the temple at Purî had once been Buddhist, that caste is ignored during the festival, and that the very name of the idol is really nothing but a misunderstood ancient epithet—the Pali word 'Jagannatha' (Lord of the World)—of the great thinker and reformer of India. We know that deaths did, in fact, and up to very recent times, take place, and were supposed to secure a happy entrance of the "soul" into realms of delight in heaven. When we call to mind how the frenzied multitudes, drunk with the luscious poison of delusions, from which the reformation they had rejected might have saved them, dragged on that sacred car, heavy and hideous with carvings of obscenity and cruelty—dragged it on in the very name of Jagan-natha, the forgotten teacher of self-control, of enlightenment and of universal love, while it creaked and crushed over the bodies of miserable suicides, the victims of once exploded superstitions—it will help us to realize how heavy is the hand of the immeasurable past; how much more powerful than the voice of the prophets is the influence of congenial fancies, and of inherited beliefs."

And now? Is there any probability of the revival of Buddhism? Has it force enough, has it any force to stand up against the altered conditions of the world? Beaten back by the fire and sword of a fierce Mohammedanism from Khiva and Bokhara, from Afghanistan and Baluchistan, from Sind and from the Panjab, will it regain there the lost territory, and restore the beautiful monuments so ruthlessly destroyed? It was the same gentle hands that gave the *coup de grâce* to Buddhism in the valley of the Ganges. The great university of Nâlandâ still existed, as the chief if not the only centre of unsectarian religious life in India when the Moslems came.

They murdered the teachers and burnt the books, and, without any military necessity that is now perceptible, destroyed the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

buildings. Can Buddhism recover there the ground it had previously lost by its own failings, and rebuild the great university now buried in heaps of ruin and covered with jungle? Can it recover its lost influence in China and Japan, where it was for a short time the dominant faith, and is now despised, again through its own weakness, by the official and ruling classes who once professed it? Is there any probability of its once again sending out its missionaries into distant lands, and gaining over new regions to its strong gospel of self-victory by self-abnegation?

The answer, so far as it can be given at all, can only be given in the light of the history of the past. In so far as it shall be able to purify itself by an intelligent approximation, indeed, by a practical return, to the teaching of the Master, there is hope for it. Its most powerful weapon, now as then, must always be the Four Truths, the Noble Path in which they culminate, the doctrine of Arahatship to which that path leads up. It is by no means sure that Buddhists throughout the world have as yet fully and consciously reached this position. But some approach, at least, to it is being brought about by two causes especially. And these are both due, oddly enough, to European and American agency—they are the influence of Christian propagandists and of European and American scholars.

One result of the first has been, and especially in those countries where it has been most vigorously carried on, to compel the Buddhists to examine their grounds of belief, and, with that object, to study more carefully their ancient literature. We see, therefore, throughout the Buddhist world an enthusiasm reawakening for education, both primary and secondary, to be conducted on their own lines. Books in manuscript, on the time-honored palm leaves, had been deemed enough when their position was not attacked. Now they are printing and circulating their books, as the Christians do; they are founding schools for both sexes; they are establishing boards of education, even high schools and colleges; and their sacred books, no longer left only in the hands of student recluses, are printed and circulated at large. *Fas est ab hoste doceri.*

On the other hand, the labors of European and American scholars are making accessible, also on this side, the ancient texts, and are even beginning to translate them into European languages, and to analyze and summarize their contents. Though

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Buddhists do not in the least agree with us, whose aim is not controversial at all, but only historical, they are beginning not only to make such use as suits them of our results, but to imitate our methods.

It may be desirable to specify, with regard to each country—for Buddhism is still an influence over widely separated portions of the globe, and the present position is different in each—how far such movements have gone. In Japan, split up as Buddhism is into many sects, of which Mr. Fujish Ma has given us so interesting an account,* the very difference of opinion has led to one sect vieing with the other in propagandist education. Several of them have even sent students over to Europe for the express purpose of learning Pali and Sanskrit—a most striking phenomenon of the time. And one or two of these students, thus trained in European knowledge, notably the gentleman already referred to, and Mr. Bunyu Nanjio, and last (not least) Mr. Takakusu, have, by their published works, added not only to native, but to European knowledge. A very excellently conducted periodical, now called *The Orient,* gives also able expression, in English, to the general Buddhist view of things, and publishes English versions of the texts held in most repute. In the face of the increased importance which recent events have given to the military caste in Japan, a caste devoted almost exclusively to the ancient paganism, the Shinto faith of their ancestors, this activity and zeal of the Buddhists is noteworthy.

In China, in this as in other respects, all is silent; or, if there be any movement, we know nothing of it. Buddhism there has always, in spite of a few intervals of royal favor, had a hard fight against Confucianism; and it lies at present, mostly from internal causes, under a cloud. But it still has a large following among the masses, and even, though they often prefer to conceal the fact, among the wealthier classes; and any revival of Chinese national feeling will have its effect also on the Buddhist communities.

In Siam, on the other hand, the Buddhist advance has the able and efficient support of the ruling family. In emulation, no doubt, and in some respects in imitation, of the Pali Text Society, the work of European scholars, the Buddhist scholars of

*"Le Bouddhisme japonais; doctrines et histoire des douze grandes sectes du Bouddhisme du Japon." Paris, 1889.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Siam—for scholarship has never died out there—have brought out, at the expense and under the patronage of their present enlightened monarch, and under the superintendence of his brother, the distinguished scholar and member of the Buddhist Order, Prince Vajira-nana, a most admirable and now nearly complete edition of the whole of their ancient sacred books, and are beginning, under the same auspices, an edition of the numerous commentaries—all in Pali, of course, but printed, not in the Pali, but in the ordinary Siamese, characters.

In Ceylon, the Buddhists—not without help, be it noted, from American sympathizers—have started new schools, both for boys and girls. They have also inaugurated colleges for the higher education of the Buddhist clergy. And more than one of these colleges, notably in Colombo under the able superintendence of the distinguished scholar Sumangala Maha Nayaka, who is an Honorary Member of the Royal Asiatic Society of England, have produced scholars and organizers who are fully awake to all the necessities of the times. There is a paper there, too, *The Buddhist,* which does for Ceylon what *The Orient* does for Japan; and a native paper, written in Singalese, the *Sava Sanda Rasa,* which is even more important, and has a large and influential circulation.

In India, an organization has been set on foot in Calcutta for the propagation of Buddhist opinion. This owed its commencement to the agency of Ceylon Buddhists, and is at present very ably presided over by a Ceylonese well known in Europe and America, Mr. Dharmapala. But it has received the adhesion and support of influential natives of India. Some of them contribute articles to its journal, the *Journal of the Maha Bodhi Society,* and others have gone to Ceylon to study Buddhism there. A principal object of the association, to obtain possession of the ancient Maha Bodhi temple, erected on the site of the spot where the Buddha obtained Nirvana, has not at present been successful. But the organization is full of life and aspiration, and it seems by no means improbable that it will succeed in spreading to a considerable extent once more in India the faith of the greatest teacher and thinker that India has yet produced.

In Burma Buddhism is at present quieter. Perhaps it is that the Buddhists there feel less than elsewhere the pressure of opposing forces. As Mr. Fielding has shown in that enchanting vol-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ume, "The Soul of a People," Buddhism is in Burma a power, and a power on the whole for good, influencing the lives of the people from the cradle to the grave. And though quiet, it is not quiescent. The press issues an increasing number of Buddhist Texts, old and new. And though the Buddhist peasantry have not yet, from financial causes, succeeded in publishing the whole of the authoritative texts of their religion, the texts they do publish have a wide circulation, and are held in high honor by the people.

There is yet another point which it would be blindness to omit in any estimate of the position of Buddhism as a living force—it is not at all improbable that it may turn out, eventually, to be the most important point of all—the quiet but irresistible way in which Buddhism is making its influence felt, quite apart from any religious propaganda, in the thought of the West. What Schopenhauer said has often been quoted, but will bear quoting again: "If I am to take the results of my own philosophy as the standard of truth, I should be obliged to concede to Buddhism the pre-eminence over the rest. In any case, it must be a satisfaction to me to find my teaching in such agreement with a religion professed by the majority of men." This would be neither the place nor the time to undertake any discussion of this utterance. It is enough to point out that Schopenhauer is, in all probability, the most influential philosopher among those now followed in Germany; and that the influence of Germany, at all events in intellectual matters, is at present, if not indeed in the ascendant, at least exceedingly powerful. It is not probable that any considerable number of people, either in Europe or America, will ever range themselves openly on the side of Buddhism, as a profession of faith. But it cannot be denied that there are certain points in the Buddhist view of life that are likely to influence, and to influence widely, with increasing intensity, the views of life, of philosophy, of ethics, as held now in the West. And not only the view of life, the method also, the system of self-training in ethical culture, has certain points which the practical Western mind is not likely, when it comes to know it, to ignore. The present results have been brought about by the knowledge of Buddhism professed by a few isolated students. It is only when the texts have been properly edited, fully translated, so studied and summarized that they have been made accessible to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every one interested in questions of philosophy and ethics, that the full power of such truth as there is in the Buddhist theory will be felt.

It cannot be considered as at all improbable that the twentieth century will see a movement of ideas not unlike in importance to that resulting from the discovery of Greek thought at the time of the Renaissance, and due, like it, to the meeting together in men's minds of two fundamentally different interpretations of the deepest problems man has to face.

T. W. Rhys Davids.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHINA AND RUSSIA.

BY JOSIAH QUINCY, FORMERLY FIRST ASSISTANT UNITED STATES SECRETARY OF STATE.

In a recent article in an English review the present writer pointed out the novel and significant character of the programme for American political action in China outlined in Secretary Hay's circular note of July 3d, indicated some of the difficulties in the way of carrying out that programme in its entirety, and advocated a frank recognition on our part of the fact that Russia is the dominant factor in the settlement of the Chinese question, and that the influence of Great Britain in the Far East has fallen to a low ebb.

The events of the last two months, of such pregnant importance and world-wide influence, have lent additional support to the views then expressed, and just as this article, written abroad, in the first week of September, is about to be forwarded to the Review, the transcendent significance of Russia's recently announced policy for the restoration of peace in China, and of the practical adhesion which the United States has apparently given to that policy, before the evacuation of Pekin had been agreed to by any other Power, is arresting the attention of all Europe. Whether the diplomatic communications now in progress modify the declared intentions of Russia and the United States or not, the announcement by the former of her desire to evacuate Pekin at once, and the prompt recognition by the latter of the fact that the ambitious programme of political reform in China cannot be carried out without the concurrence of all the Powers, and the support of Russia most of all, are events of the first importance. It would, indeed, be hard to place limits upon the influence which they may exert, not alone upon the future of China, but upon international relations all over the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Already serious friction is apparently created between Russia and Germany, and the unexpected turn of affairs may afford Great Britain an opportunity, by throwing her weight on to the side of Germany, to put an end to her position of diplomatic isolation in the Far East, and to secure at least one powerful friend; while Japan would also be not unlikely to join in an Anglo-German *entente,* in spite of her distrust of the latter Power. It must, moreover, be recognized that, while the Triple Alliance has technically nothing to do with the Chinese question, yet as one of its chief objects is defense against Russia, Austria-Hungary and Italy could not well remain indifferent to any events in Asia which threatened to deal a serious blow to the prestige of their stronger ally, and so to weaken her influence in Europe, particularly if this blow came from Russia. These two Powers may not count directly in Asia; but they are still among the six great Powers of Europe, and it is now clear enough that the politics of Asia are inextricably bound up with those of Europe—if, indeed, they do not involve the future of all mankind.

The action of our own Government for the last year in connection with Chinese affairs, beginning with the circular note of Secretary Hay relative to the "open door" policy, in September, 1899, has certainly, in the main, been wise and conservative, and it may well be conceded that if the record closes equally well, a creditable chapter will have been added to the annals of American diplomacy. But the critical period of the real difficulties is just upon us, and this may last even for years before any final settlement is effected—if, indeed, the Chinese puzzle is to be solved at all in our day, which is by no means certain. It may not, therefore, be out of place to point out, in a spirit of considerate criticism, two mistakes, perhaps not unnatural ones, and fortunately not of the gravest importance or incapable of correction, which the present Administration seems to have made.

In the first place, the programme outlined in Secretary Hay's note of July 3d, while excellent ideally, was too ambitious and comprehensive in its scope, and too political in its character, differing radically in the latter respect from the policy embodied in his negotiations for the maintenance of the "open door" for commerce. His promise to hold the responsible authors of wrongs to American citizens to "the uttermost accountability"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can easily be seen, in the light of recent developments, to have been somewhat too sweeping, and a more intimate knowledge of existing conditions in China would, doubtless, have prevented it from being made. It is never wise to threaten punishment which cannot be inflicted; and even on July 3d it should have been sufficiently evident that the difficulties in the way of even ascertaining, to say nothing of punishing, the "responsible authors" of outrages would be so great as to make threats worse than idle; and a great nation cannot but suffer some loss of dignity if unable to make good its solemn words. It would have been better to leave entirely to the German Emperor all expressions in favor of punishment or vengeance in the face of such a terrible upheaval as threatens the very foundations of social order in China.

In further declaring it to be the policy of the United States to seek a solution of the existing troubles which should "prevent a recurrence of such disasters, bring about permanent safety and peace in China," Secretary Hay plainly implied the intention of our Government to join in political action for the radical reconstruction of Chinese administration. Fortunately, his language is general and does not hold us to any specific programme, and when it suits our convenience we can dismiss it as a mere expression of pious good will toward the Chinese people; but taking the then existing conditions in connection with the context, it is sufficiently clear that the intention was to commit the United States to political action for the reform of Chinese government—an object quite outside the scope of previous American policy in the Far East, impossible of attainment by our own independent action and, if pursued in common with other Powers, fraught with the gravest possibilities of those international entanglements with European nations, which it is our historical policy to keep out of. The Chinese government is, indeed, in the most crying need of reconstruction, whether from within or from without. But if this reform is to come from within, we have no more right to interfere with the internal politics of China than she has to take sides in our Presidential election; if from without, we had much better leave this huge, if not impossible, task to such nations as Russia or Japan, which could alone attempt it with any hope of success. It is not the mission of the United States to set right everything that is amiss all over the world, even if we have interests involved, or to take part in remodelling

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the government of some four hundred millions of people who deeply resent foreign interference with their affairs. The idea of joining a syndicate of nations for the establishment of a political trust to regulate the affairs of the world may be a dazzling one, but when it seriously appeals to the United States, the whole character of our government and of our institutions will have to be changed; for world-empire and democracy are inconsistent with each other and cannot co-exist. Fortunately, the territory and power of the whole eastern hemisphere have already been so far divided up or pre-empted among the older nations that the share which a new political partner would now receive would not be a very tempting one, in comparison with their great empires and dependencies—and perhaps we have our share in the political hegemony of the whole American hemisphere under the Monroe doctrine, to say nothing of our newly acquired islands.

The second mistake of the Administration was its assent to the appointment of a Commander-in-Chief of the forces of the allied Powers. No exception can, of course, be taken to the eminent fitness of Count Von Waldersee to assume a military position of such delicacy and importance; and if, as appears to be the case, the selection of any German officer for this command was somewhat unfortunate—owing to the aggressive attitude of the German Emperor and the probability, to say the least, that his designs in China are too comprehensive—no part of this responsibility seems to attach to our own Government. But a willingness to place American troops under any foreign officer implied a closer alliance with other Powers in China than was consistent with the independent attitude of the United States in Asiatic affairs in the past, and involved unknown risks of entangling us in political complications. For, under such conditions as now exist in China, it is impossible to draw any line between military and political action, and the authority of Count von Waldersee would necessarily have covered both fields; indeed, it is now claimed that, even if all military operations were entirely finished before his arrival, he would still have the practical settlement of the conditions of a truce and of opening negotiations. If he had been on the spot when the troops were preparing to start for Pekin, the case might, indeed, have been different, and supposed military necessity might have justified our assent to his appointment; but at the time when we gave that assent, he was in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe, and it was already plain that the legations were altogether likely to be relieved, if their inmates remained alive, long before he could reach China. If our sole military object was to relieve our own legation and citizens, and to take part in a longer or shorter occupation of Pekin—and it should not have been, and probably was not, any more comprehensive, as we took pains to disclaim being at war with China—then we should have replied that if this purpose had not been attained by the time Count von Waldersee arrived on the scene of action, we should be very glad to place our troops under an officer of such high qualifications. As things have turned out, this appointment, no doubt intended to secure greater harmony between the Powers, seems to be a threatening source of discord, and at least one of the obstacles in the way of a speedy re-establishment of peace seems to lie in the difficulty of saving the dignity of the Commander-in-Chief (not, be it noted, in China, but only in the Province of Pechili,) and of the country which he represents, and of finding something for him to do consistent with his high rank and functions. The United States at least might, by a little prudence, and without any discourtesy to Germany, have kept out of this complication and the jealousies which it may engender.

It is pleasant to turn from these minor errors in our diplomacy to the sound statesmanship embodied in the circular note of the State Department, based upon the Russian proposal for the evacuation of Pekin. The full text of the circular instructions from the Russian Foreign Office to its representatives abroad, under date of August 25th, which afforded the basis for the oral communication from the Russian *Chargé d'Affaires* at Washington, furnishes the public with an authoritative and important definition of Russian policy in China, as formed subsequently to the relief of the legations, and designed to meet the new conditions existing after that event. It may be significant that, while the wording of the Russian circular is definite in regard to the withdrawal of the Russian legation from Pekin, it says nothing directly about the withdrawal of troops from that city; this proposal is only found in the oral communication to our own Government, and this fact seems to prove Russia's wish to secure the support of the United States for this step, before communicating her desire or intention to any other Power—another instance of the masterly skill of her diplomacy. The prevention

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of any *entente* between Great Britain and the United States, and the strengthening of her own friendly relations with us, being important objects of her policy, she saw her opportunity, by consulting us first, to have what would seem to be a Russo-American proposal presented to the other Powers, and to signify to the world that Russia and America, at least, could act in harmony in China. If Great Britain should follow, the policy of Russia in China would be forwarded; if she should decline to follow, a divergence in policy between her and the United States would be created. Fully understanding the purely pacific and commercial policy of the United States in China—realizing, perhaps, also that a political campaign in which the party in power was charged with a tendency to Imperialism and Militarism, afforded a peculiarly favorable opportunity for securing acceptance of any proposal which on its face looked like the re-establishment of peace in China—Russia made a bold and winning stroke!

Her opponents might, indeed, say that she laid a trap which we fell into; that, as our Government did not believe in the expediency of at once withdrawing the international troops from Pekin—as it distinctly stated in the circular note communicating the Russian proposal—it should not have informed Russia what it would do in the event of her separate withdrawal of her own troops, but should merely have invited an expression of opinion from the other Powers. By the response actually made, Russia is assured that, unless the United States changes its position, she will have the company of at least one other Power if she withdraws her troops. She has only, therefore, to adhere to her intention in order either to impose her policy of evacuation upon all the other Powers, or at the worst to enjoy the great moral and political advantage of having America act with her in the carrying out of her pacific policy—certainly no inconsiderable achievement for Russian diplomacy in either case.

If our policy is to act in especial co-operation with Great Britain, or merely to adhere to whatever course the other Powers represented in the concert may agree to, the answer of the State Department to Russia was a serious blunder. If, on the other hand, as the writer believes, our true policy should be not to follow blindly even the decisions of a unanimous concert; to retain as far as possible our traditional independence of action in China; to avoid at all hazards becoming involved in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European diplomatic situation; to endeavor to keep on terms of equal and impartial friendship with all the Powers, but to recognize, if we are forced to choose between them, that Russia is already the dominant factor in Asia, and that friendly relations with her are likely to be of the greatest future importance to our commerce; then the course of our Government in agreeing, in accordance with our own pacific policy and with our friendly attitude toward China, to take a step which, on the surface, at least, seemed likely to hasten the return of peace, its willingness to stand alone with Russia, if necessary, and its recognition of the fact that nothing useful could be accomplished by remaining at Pekin without her—are worthy of all commendation.

We should never lose sight of the cardinal fact in the Chinese situation, so far as we are concerned—namely, that we have no present or prospective territorial or political interests, "spheres of influence," or "leases" of ports, in China, and that we do not want any—in which respects we are in a radically different position from all the other Powers represented in the concert. If we have joined with other nations in forcing our missionaries and our trade on China, we have not, at least, participated in the exaction of those cessions of territory and comprehensive privileges which seem to have been the direct cause of the present outbreak. We may, therefore, well leave the main task of quelling the storm to those Powers which have raised it, merely safeguarding our own special interests, so far as that is possible.

In another respect, also, the position of the United States in China is fundamentally different from that of the other allied Powers. Every one of these has such important interests at stake or such political alliances in Europe, that it must unfortunately consider becoming involved in war over the issues to be settled in Asia as at least a possibility—and each is at present practically on a war footing, though this can only be said of Great Britain owing to the conflict in South Africa. Doubtless, the tremendous disasters which would be involved in any war carried on between two great Powers under modern conditions—disasters which would fall only less heavily upon the victors than upon the vanquished—are fully realized by responsible statesmen and rulers, and this knowledge makes their action most careful and conservative. Yet to the European Powers and Japan the dread possibility of armed conflict is always present in the background.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fortunately for the United States, in spite of our large army in the Philippines and our troops now in China, no sane American thinks that we will fight with any other member of the concert, whatever may be our policy or our interests, either to prevent the dismemberment of China or to secure any share in the partition for ourselves, or to reform the Chinese government, or even to maintain the "open door" for our trade. This certainly affords another cogent consideration in favor of keeping out of the threatening complications which may lead to war between the Powers; for, if we do not mean to fight, neither do we want to suffer any loss of dignity or prestige.

As to the merits of the Russian proposal for a withdrawal of all the troops from Pekin as a preliminary to the opening of negotiations, opinions may well differ; apparently conclusive objections can be brought both against the policy of evacuating the capital and against that of continuing its occupation—yet one or the other must be adopted. The Powers are face to face with a dilemma, and it is hard to say which horn is the sharpest. If they withdraw and practically invite the conspirators in high places to come back to the capital and negotiate safely at arms' length, they run the risk of fatally lowering Western prestige in China, of leaving the moral victory with the Chinese, of failing to secure any reasonable satisfaction or retribution, and of making possible in a few years another similar outbreak. If they remain, the imperial government will doubtless decline to return to Pekin and will render itself inaccessible in the interior—for it is beyond the power even of the combined nations to chase a will-o'-the-wisp Empress all over China, and maintain their communications with the coast in the midst of a large and hostile population. The consequences are most serious in any case; if the imperial government can from a new capital in the interior command the obedience of the provincial authorities, all China is likely to be involved in the trouble; if it cannot, then a condition of anarchy prevails, and a civil war among the Chinese themselves may add its untold horrors to the situation in either event. Almost any government is better than no government at all, and the fact that some twenty millions of lives were lost in the attempt to overthrow the Manchu dynasty through the Taeping rebellion may well give pause to the Powers in considering the consequences of changing the imperial houses. The hands of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Empress and her ministers may be red with foreign blood, but as this is probably incapable of legal proof, however morally certain, and as Chinese ingenuity may be trusted to frame some elaborate and plausible excuse for her, such as coercion, the Powers may yet be obliged to accept the theory which Russia finds it convenient to adopt—namely, that every act of violence has been committed by rebels against the lawful imperial authority.

There are some strong reasons and strong sentimental considerations in favor of reasserting the authority of the unfortunate Emperor; but, aside from the preliminary difficulty of rescuing him from the clutches of the Empress, there remains the apparently fatal objection that he is now mentally and physically incapable of governing, and that the imperial power would in reality be exercised by others if nominally revested in him—a condition of things which might make the last state of Chinese government worse than the first. In short, the difficulties of getting away from the Empress are so immense that diplomacy may be obliged to adopt the fiction of her innocence as the only way of putting an end to an intolerable situation. If she is inconsiderate enough to refuse to return to her capital until the foreign troops are withdrawn, it is hard to see what is to be gained by keeping them there, unless, indeed, the Powers are prepared to place a force of several hundred thousand men in garrison at different points in China, and to exercise some real and effective control over the country—which they thus far indicate no willingness to do.

There remains to consider the possibility of changing the capital from Pekin to some other point, which would make the continuance of the occupation of that city a question of minor importance. There seems to be two insuperable obstacles in the way of this alternative; first, the very reasons which would make most of the foreign Powers desire it would make the Chinese Government decline it, unless under absolute compulsion, which the Powers are as yet far from being in a position to apply, and, second, Russia would certainly object to a removal of the capital from Pekin, and her objection would make such a course impossible. This brings us to the real crux of the situation, namely, the fact that the interests of Russia in China and her relations to the Celestial Empire are entirely different from those of any other Power; that her position is already stronger than that of any of her rivals in the Far East, and may soon become impregnable,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that if she can avoid war she may almost be said to hold the future of China in the hollow of her hand—though the process of asserting her full control is likely to be a long and gradual one. In short, Russia holds the winning cards in her hand, and knows how to play them.

The simple fact that Russia has a frontier coterminous with that of China for some four thousand miles requires that her policy toward that Empire should be based on very different considerations from those which the other nations need take into account. No other Power represented in the concert is a territorial neighbor of China, except through distant dependencies—France through Tong-king, and Great Britain through Burma; and of these two frontiers, that of France, the ally of Russia, is by far the more important. Russia is uniting her empire with China by railroads; the other Powers must always be dependent upon communications by sea. Japan, indeed, is a near neighbor of China; but the fact that she is separated from the Celestial Empire by water makes her necessary relations to the problem differ as much from those of Russia as the situation of England with reference to France is distinguished from that of Germany. The difference between sea and land relations of offense and defense between nations is fundamental. With Russia the security of a frontier of enormous extent must be a primary consideration, and recent events prove that its liability to attack is by no means merely a theoretical one. The last thing that she desires, or can afford, is to have to maintain this frontier in a perpetual state of defense against possible attack. For this reason alone, if for no other, the maintenance of friendly relations with China must be a cardinal point in her policy in Asia.

China cannot strike other nations except through their interests on her coasts, or within her borders; she can strike Russia within the Empire of the Czar, and it is at least conceivable and possible, even if quite unlikely, that she might some day organize out of her teeming population armies which would repeat the Tartar invasion. Russia has not yet forgotten that these fierce Asiatics ruled her people for over two centuries, and the overthrow of their domination is of as recent date as the discovery of America. While all the conditions of warfare have changed since Genghis Khan started the career of Asiatic conquest to the westward, the marvelous history of Japanese development within

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a single generation proves that, under some circumstances, Orientals can assimilate the material side of Western civilization, including its methods of fighting, with extraordinary rapidity and success. The striking military progress made by the Chinese themselves in the few years since the close of their war with Japan affords another illustration of this fact. Russians believe that, if Japan were once allowed to organize and arm the Chinese, their own great Asiatic Empire would be in imminent peril, if not their European territory as well; and it must be admitted that their fears seem to be well founded. A cardinal point in Russian policy is, therefore, to keep Japan out of China at all hazards, and out of Corea, if possible; hence her alarm at the cession of the Liao-tung peninsula to Japan after the war, and her coercion of that Power, in combination with France and Germany, to give up this important part of the fruits of her victory.

Russia is forced by her situation to consider more seriously than any other Power the immense possibilities of danger involved in crowding too hard a nation of some four hundred millions of people, constituting the most ancient empire in existence, and united by a spirit of opposition to foreigners. No other great nation would have submitted for a moment to the indignities which have been heaped on China by other Powers, or to the exactions which they have enforced, and she has only submitted because she was helpless to resist. Russia, at least, if not the other Powers, must take into account the possibility that China may cease to be powerless; that she may learn the art of military organization which some have been so anxious to teach her, and that she may develop resources of offense as well as for defense.

Russia, therefore, vulnerable by land, must take a deep interest in the Chinese question as a measure of self defense; to her it is no mere matter of commerce or exploitation in remote regions, but of national security itself. If China is helpless, Russia cannot safely allow any other Power to take advantage of that helplessness to build up a controlling influence upon the ruins of the Celestial Empire; if China is not helpless, and may even become powerful, Russia must maintain such relations with her as may best safeguard the interests of her own great empire. If China is for the Chinese, Russia must be her next friend; if not, then her protector. There would seem to be as strong a foundation for a Russian Monroe doctrine to protect the remaining in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tegrity of China as for an American Monroe doctrine to protect the integrity of the South American republics. The declared policy as well as the plain interest of the United States is in favor of maintaining all that remains of Chinese "administrative entity" and territory; and if the interest of Russia is enlisted in the same direction, more strongly than that of any other Power, this would seem to afford one sound basis of co-operation between the two countries.

The above considerations have a vital relation to the question of withdrawal from Pekin. The presence of foreign troops on Chinese soil is objectionable from the Russian standpoint above indicated, though she fully recognized its necessity while the legations were in peril. Anything which tends toward a removal of the capital from Pekin is also strongly opposed to her interests; and the continuance of its occupation by foreign troops would certainly have such a tendency, in view of the unwillingness of the imperial government to return there while such occupation lasts. Pekin is the most favorable possible residence for the Chinese court, with a view to the predominance of Russian influence, and it is not to be wondered at that she proposes to give the Empress every facility to return there. Russia will doubtless be able to prevent the removal of the capital, if central government is to continue in China, to any point more convenient to the interests of her rivals and less advantageous to herself. Tientsin, the port of Pekin, is right across the gulf from Russia's great naval stronghold and base at Port Arthur; and the capital itself is connected by railroads already built with Mukden, in Manchuria, whence railroad construction before the present outbreak was being rapidly pushed northward to join with the Trans-Siberian line. Within a comparatively short time there will be all-rail connection between St. Petersburg and Pekin. A part of this line, to be sure, is at present more or less under British control, but this difficulty will be obviated in some way, and Russia had already applied for an independent concession—indeed, one of her plans, by no means unlikely to be carried out later, is a direct line from Irkutsk to Pekin, reducing by almost one-half the distance by the route through Manchuria.

It must be remembered, too, that, so far as "spheres of influence" have been defined, the Russian sphere is better situated for the domination of Pekin than any other. Great Britain has for-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mally recognized that the whole of Mongolia and Manchuria come within the sphere of Russia so far as the building of railroads is concerned, and no other Power is likely to dispute her ear-marking of that territory. When Russia has completed her railroads and can land a large body of troops in the Chinese capital at short notice, China is not likely to be in much doubt as to which Power can best play the role of protector of her Government, alike against domestic trouble and foreign pressure.

Indeed, there were not lacking signs that Chinese statesmen had already recognized that their country could not continue its policy of political isolation, and that it must place either Russia or Japan practically in the position of an ally upon whom it could lean; and Russia is pressing at their gates, while Japan is across the Yellow Sea. Russian influence was dominant at Pekin before the outbreak of the great conspiracy to drive all foreigners out of China by one supreme and general effort. Doubtless the Chinese do not love Russians any more than they do other foreigners, and when the storm broke it spent its force, perhaps, more against Russia than any other Power, for her Manchuria railroad, in Chinese territory, and her unprotected frontier offered easy marks for attack. But when political calm returns, the rulers of the Chinese, if not the people themselves, must again recognize the strength of Russia's position, and must remember not only the service which she rendered to their Empire by rescuing the Liao-tung peninsula from Japan, but the recent manifestation of her friendship in proposing the evacuation of Pekin. It is not a fact devoid of significance or importance that it is through the aged statesman, Li-Hung-chang, who is recognized as being the firm friend of Russia, whether through a patriotic belief that the Government of the Czar can best protect China, or through less creditable motives, that the imperial government proposes to negotiate for peace. Russia is likely to have rather more to say than any other Power as to what the terms of peace are to be, and as to the manner in which China is to make reparation for the unparalleled outrages which some of her officials and citizens have committed. The fact that her own territory was wantonly attacked, and that enormous damage was done to her great railway, in process of construction under proper legal authority, joined with the other considerations above indicated, may even entitle her to that preponderant influence.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In conculsion, three other facts may be referred to which seem to give Russia pre-eminent advantage in connection with the Chinese situation. The first is her alliance with France, and no other Power as yet enjoys the advantages of any alliance in the Far East. However, new political groups may be formed by coming events. The possessions bordering China on the south, upon which France has expended upwards of two hundred million dollars, offer an excellent base for dominating the important southern provinces of that Empire, and the French are building railroads, asserting spheres of influence, and pushing forward their interests with great activity. The consistent mutual support which France and Russia give each other in Asia, and their zealous co-operation in resisting British influence and thwarting British plans, is a political fact of vital importance in the future of Asia. If they can join hands across the Yangtze Valley—England's supposed sphere, to which, however, she cannot yet show any good title—thus cutting the British line of communication between Shanghai and India, they will have accomplished in Asia what France tried to do alone in Africa when she sought to break the Cairo-to-the-Cape line at Fashoda. Moreover, the position of France as the recognized official protector of Catholic missions gives her a vantage ground which she is not slow to utilize for extending her power. The second point of advantage enjoyed by Russia, which she shares only with Japan, is the fact that she has no missionaries in China and does not seek to impose her religion on the Chinese people. When it is considered how much friction with other Powers arises out of the presence of missionaries, the Chinese may give no small weight to this point, when they come to seriously consider upon which Power they had best lean.

Thirdly, Russia, being semi-Asiatic herself, having for centuries been in close contact with Orientals, first ruled by them and later ruling over them, can understand Chinese methods of government and habits of thought better than any other Power, excepting only Japan; and Russian methods of government, autocratic and arbitrary as they may appear from a democratic standpoint, may be better adapted than those of more liberally governed nations to the stage of political development existing in China.

The natural and legitimate character of the expansion of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia to the Pacific, the fact that she has a real civilizing mission in Asia, however her own civilization may fall below the European standard in some respects; the service which she is rendering to the future commerce of the world by the great continental railroad which she is building at such an enormous cost; the pacific character of her policy—these are points which cannot be treated within the limits of this article. The maintenance of friendly relations with Russia should be as cardinal a point in our diplomatic policy as the cultivation of similar relations with us is in her own programme. Each nation has expanded across a continent, from one ocean to another; we meet as friends upon the shores of the Pacific—the great arena in which, perhaps, is to be fought out, in war or in peace, the struggle for political or commercial supremacy. JOSIAH QUINCY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JAMES MARTINEAU.

BY THE REV. A. W. JACKSON.

THE years glide rapidly away, and with them impressions fade and enthusiasms wane. Events that now seem the hinge of destiny may look quite unimportant in the retrospect of a decade, as in climbing Monadnock the hills most formidable from the other side sink into the level of the landscape as we rise. But while, for the most part, the clock ticks uneventful minutes there come the "striking hours," incidents which, though wearing a trifling look to others, mark epochs in the individual life. Such an incident lies fair in the memory of one who, thirty years ago, was a student at Harvard. It was the casual opening of a book which he had never seen before, and of the author of which he had never heard. A sentence arrested his attention, another charmed him, another absorbed him, and presently he was as little at his own disposal as if afloat on the whirlpool of Niagara River. He had fallen under the spell of one to whom were the philosopher's insight and the prophet's fire. The book became the companion of his weariness and leisure, another from the same pen was found, and others were taken as they came; and thus his opening of that book proved his first contact with an influence that more than any other was to mould his life. Years sped on; disciple and master had found each other out, and this ascendency was to be brought to the proof of personal encounter. The teachers whom we know only in letters enjoy a happy immunity from personal frailties, which living contact is so likely to reveal, a truth which at this juncture came home to the disciple with very natural anxieties. This master was of the royal line of scholars, but so were Johnson and Gibbon; he was a thinker, but such was also Schopenhauer; he was endowed with genius, but so were Bacon and Voltaire. From such ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amples the disciple conceived it not improbable that through some infirmity of spirit the master might furnish an unhappy commentary upon his record, and dreaded the acquaintance that involved this liability. It was his happy discovery that not only were his anxieties groundless, but that through the great page that so long had instructed him he had held communion with a spirit that was far greater.

I.

That book was the "Endeavors After the Christian Life." The story is autobiography, with which confession enough is told of the personal affection that rules the following pages. Dr. Martineau was of Huguenot descent. His family tradition is drawn from Bergerac in France, where his ancestors may have witnessed, and not unlikely experienced, the horrors of the Dragonade. His line first comes clearly into view with a certain Gaston Martineau, a surgeon, who, driven by the persecution that followed the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, fled into England. On the ship that bore him across the Channel was a family of refugees, one member of which was a young woman who became afterward his wife. He settled in Norwich, where he prospered by his skill and reared a numerous family. The date of his reaching England cannot now be definitely told, but soon after 1685, the date of the bodeful Revocation. A son adopted his profession and followed in his walks, and a grandson and great grandson did the same. The latter was Phillip Meadows Martineau, celebrated in his day both as practitioner and author, nor yet forgotten. A younger brother of Phillip Meadows, Thomas Martineau, was destined to become James Martineau's father. Thus, behind Dr. Martineau were four generations of surgeons who had practised their skill in England; while tradition of the ancestral Bergerac carries still further up their line. To such as would study him in the light of heredity, here is material. All students of Dr. Martineau are sensible of his strong grasp upon scientific principles, a grasp that makes easy the belief that he might have triumphed at the problems of Herschel and Faraday had he not chosen to toil rather at those of Plato and Spinoza; and which in these days it is difficult not to connect with the scientific discipline of those generations of surgeons. While thus taking account of his inherited qualities, his Huguenot descent also comes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before us. The Huguenots were despoiled of about everything that makes life outwardly desirable; but through their sufferings they won for their children that surest of legacies, *a virtue proven in the fire of persecution.* Brief time may work great changes in human standards; and ancestor and descendant, viewing each other across the graves of four generations, in their vision of the world and their moral judgments would rarely discern the tokens of their kinship. But a virtue victorious in an ordeal such as the French Protestants were brought to, becomes a moral strain that many generations must witness; and as beneath the grace of Emerson we discern the iron of the Puritan, so in Dr. Martineau with finer insight and larger outlook the Huguenot toiled with us.

His early home was the ancestral Norwich. His father was a man of gentle spirit and stern rectitude; his mother was practical and resourceful. She bore eight children, of whom James, born April 21, 1805, was the seventh. A mother with eight children, though she gives them severally all her love, must divide to them her care, and so bring them early to the useful lessons of mutual helpfulness and self-dependence; and these lessons were emphasized in the Martineau household. Of the spirit of the maternal watch Dr. Martineau is our witness, and he tells of an affection less manifest in endearments than in constancy of service, yet warm and winning and unfailing. It seems the more desirable to say this because Harriet Martineau, writing in later life and throwing back its darkness upon her past, gave an unpleasant impression of her mother, which Mrs. Chapman, and later Mrs. Fenwick Miller, copied from her. Religion gave tone to the family life, rather elastic as to its dogmas and not austere as to its practices, but keeping ever in view the truth that the kingdom of God is not meat and drink. This was easy faith when the board was affluently spread; its practical hold was proven when meat and drink became an exigent consideration. Thomas Martineau was a manufacturer, and the product of his mills went to Spain. In 1823 France threw her armies upon Spain and won an easy victory. New commercial regulations were dictated to the advantage of France, but to the grievous loss of England. Thomas Martineau's Spanish trade was cut off, and, despite his bravest efforts, his business rapidly declined. At length he could honorably conceal his embarrassments no longer, and laid his affairs before his creditors. They found his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liabilities £100,000 and his assets £75,000. Fifteen shillings to the pound might have been paid and release obtained, and the standards of business honor satisfied. Fifteen shillings, however, are less than a pound, and, according to *Martineau* standards, neither war nor any other calamity could excuse the non-payment of a debt which any toil or sacrifice could cancel. Accordingly, he begged permission to undertake to pay all. The struggle outlasted his life, and was carried on in filial piety by his sons. It proved a maelstrom that sucked in all the family fortune; but at last the debt was paid, and the family could face the world with poverty and honor. Two of the daughters must needs take service as governesses and Harriet incur the hardships of her brave early career; but we hear no chafe, rather a note of exultation that through the sacrifice of meat and drink they had stood fast in their allegiance to the kingdom of God.

While such was the spirit of the home, how of its immediate surroundings? For these, like elevation and prospect and exposure, are of great significance to an unfolding life. Norwich was indeed no Athens of poets and philosophers, nor yet a Nazareth from which no good thing was to be expected. Though a manufacturing city, it had an intellectual life not to be despised. Here was William Taylor, an industrious contributor to the periodicals of the day on subjects of foreign literature, and one of the earliest guides of English readers into the wonder-realm of German poetry; also Frank Sayers, an explorer of Northern Mythology, a poet not to be despised and a metaphysician of clear insight; also Drs. Rigsby and Alderson, earnest toilers in the fields of science, and others whose names have come to us, and whose works we meet—not stars, indeed, but candles; and where it otherwise were dark, a candle makes a cheerful difference. Here, too, was Amelia Opie, whose novels, if not great, were wholesome, and gained a popularity that outlived her; and here was Anna Letitia Barbauld, whose sweet verse just missed of fame. All these might have been met in the Martineau household, which, of high standing in itself, and representing a family for more than a hundred years honorably identified with the city, naturally drew to itself men and women who thought and aspired.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

Mr. Martineau's education began in a grammar school at Norwich, a foundation of the fourteenth century. To this he was sent as a day-scholar from eight to fourteen years of age. It had educated a goodly number who had become eminent men, and so was a school of reputation. Dr. Samuel Parr had at one time been at its head, and it was now under the charge of Edward Valpy, a classical scholar of reputation in his day, nor yet forgotten. Under such a master the natural emphasis of the school was upon classical studies, and in these the young pupil made rapid progress. He also learned the French language; but in mathematics, then as ever after a favorite study, he received no satisfactory training. In a public school of two hundred pupils rude elements are to be looked for, and the sensitive and shrinking child who has endured well should have a tolerable martyrdom set down to his credit. James Martineau was this kind of boy. His, too, was a moral sensibility to which the hectoring and teasing were moral affronts of serious proportions. Accordingly, he was not happy here.

After six years a change seemed expedient. His sister Harriet, returning from Bristol, where she had been visiting, was eloquent in her praises of Lant Carpenter, who exercised the twofold office of preacher and teacher there. To receive tuition from Lant Carpenter must have been rare privilege to any earnest young man. His learning was ample and peculiarly well rounded; his apprehensions were quick and clear and vivid; he carried to his labors a moral enthusiasm that was contagious. He was, in short, a teacher after Montaigne's ideal, who could teach virtue as well as how to decline *virtus,* and the two lessons ever went along together. In his presence was a grace that few could resist; his character was of that virile sort which young men always admire; he was tireless in service; his enthusiasm was boundless; and he held his pupils to extraordinary achievement, not through the exactions he laid upon them, but the inspirations with which he aroused them. To this teacher young James was now committed, and in him he came in contact with one of the master influences of his life. Under the spell of Lant Carpenter his whole nature was awakened. Dr. Martineau was never stingy in recognition of those who had helped him, but to no other did

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he bear testimony so affluent as to his Bristol school-master. Writing of him in 1841, he said: "So forcibly, indeed, did that period act—so visibly did it determine the subsequent direction of my mind and lot, that it always stands before me as the commencement of my present life, making me feel like a man without a childhood; and though a multitude of earlier scenes are still in view, they seem to be spread around a different being, and to belong, like the incidents of a dream, to some foreign self that became extinct when the morning light of reality broke upon the sight."

Only two years, however, of this high privilege were allowed him. His father had decided that he was to be an engineer; another, that is, was to be added to the many attempts, some of them sadly successful, to make Apollo a farmhand for Admetos. Accordingly, he was placed with a firm of engineers at Derby to learn his profession. For a year he was kept at the lathe or at the bench of the model-room. As we view him now, the mistake seems plain enough; but as Gibbon conceived that the captain of the Hampshire Grenadiers had not been useless to the historian of the Roman Empire, so these labors may have been not without profit to the future philosopher of religion. Two or three circumstances, however, conspired against this enterprise. The work was not uncongenial, but he was given an incompetent teacher, who taught him a trade rather than a science, and he was dissatisfied. More significant than this fact, the spell of his Bristol school-master was upon him. More significant still, the calling whereto he was called was declaring itself within him. So at the end of the year he made known to his parents his desire to become a minister. Though this was unwelcome intelligence, they were too wise to oppose him, and at once took into consideration the comprehensive education which it seemed to them a clergyman needed. But where should he be educated? The Oxford that afterward honored him could not then receive him by reason of the creed-subscription she must exact of him, nor, for the same reason, could Cambridge. Besides, though the evil days were not yet, the family exchequer would not indulge a lavish expenditure. There, however, was Manchester New College, which furnished "free learning" at small cost, and which, if with small constituency, was writing an heroic history. At a time when the State Church would punish with ignorance such as could not sign her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creed there began a long struggle for the higher academic culture beyond the range of her immediate control. To establish an institution, however, that should provide this in the face of the hostility of the Church and the prestige of the universities was no easy task; and in the course of a century six institutions, succeeding one to another, had run through their brief career. Then Manchester College was established at Manchester. Here it struggled for seventeen years. Thence it was moved to York, where it upheld its torch for thirty-seven years. Thence it was returned to Manchester, where it toiled on thirteen years. Thence it was moved to London, whence, after a stay of thirty-six years, it was transferred to Oxford, where it now is. Here we trust its wanderings are over, and that it may long diffuse its light. It was in the York period of this peripatetic service that James Martineau, aged seventeen, sought admission. Its resources look meagre enough when compared with those of the Oxford or Harvard of to-day, or even of that day. He found, however, two things alone indispensable to such a student, opportunity equal to his powers and teachers equal to his guidance. Of two of these, John Kenrick and Charles Wellbeloved, he never tired of celebrating the praises. The course, in part secular, in part theological, was of five years' length, and the zeal of the student spared not. John Kenrick twice mentions his "intemperate study." At the end of this period he stepped forth equipped for the great task that was before him.

At least, so he thought and friends and teachers judged; yet there was another and most important period of tuition before him. In these college years he had become familiar with the classical and Hebrew tongues; his scientific training had been severe; the standards of critical judgment, historical and theological, had been borne in upon him; he had learned the attitude of the schools; but a key to the universe he had not found; a key, that is, that he could use. In ethics he had received in its essential features the Hedonism of which Bentham was the apostle; in philosophy he had been trained on the doctrines of Locke and Hartley, which made much of the senses and something of the reason, but allowed to the soul no oracles. Both these types of doctrine, while in the ascendant in England, were all in all in his immediate surroundings; and he received them with a pupil's docility because they were taught him. We now see plainly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough that from the very structure of his nature these doctrines could not do for him, that ere he could perform his appointed work he must renounce them. Before he could see their inadequacy, however, he must make trial of them. A year after his graduation he was ordained and settled over the Eustace Street Presbyterian Church in Dublin. Three years later he crossed over to Liverpool, where a notable career as a clergyman was before him. Soon the reviews gave evidence of a new man. In 1836 he published his first book, the "Rationale of Religious Inquiry." In 1839 he bore the leader's part in that titanic struggle known as the Liverpool Controversy. He came into wide demand for an occasional address or sermon or lecture. Thus in these earlier years, before the deeper problems of thought especially engaged him, he traced a considerable record; and he who examines it with care may see that within the formularies of Locke there was not scope for his vision, that to a hedonistic ethic his ethical appeal did not and could not ring true. At length, in 1840, he was appointed to the chair of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in the college that had educated him, the duties of which he discharged conjointly with his clerical offices. At the threshold of this new career an incident occurred that should have shown him his tendencies could he have seen. He believed himself safely within the lines of the dominant English philosophy; but the *syllabus* of his first course of lectures, falling into the hands of John Stuart Mill, his keen eye detected an incipient apostasy, of which he gave frank and friendly warning. As he went on his experiences were precisely those of one whose intellectual bearings are not well assured. Recorded judgments he needed too often to qualify; keen questions from his class forced him into embarrassing dilemmas. As an intellectual sailor his received philosophy was the chart of his voyaging, but in his heaven hung stars from which he was ever tempted to take an independent reckoning, and between chart and star there was unsteadiness in his sailing. At length, in 1848, his congregation found it necessary to build a new church, and he embraced the opportunity for a period of rest and study in Germany. Incidentally, the journey yielded much. There was the kindling spectacle of the Bavarian Alps; there was a six weeks' residence in a secularized monastery at St. Zeno; there was a sail in a private boat down the Danube; there was a period of wonder and joy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amid the treasures of art at Vienna; there was the forming of noble friendships, especially those of the Zumpts, Von Ranke and Trendelenburg. The ruling purpose of his journey, however, was study, not diversion. Trendelenburg was then at Berlin at the height of his fame and power, and Mr. Martineau sat down at his feet. Trendelenburg was a great expounder of the Stagirite, and this circumstance brought Mr. Martineau to Greek philosophical studies, the effect of which was, in his own language, "a new intellectual birth." He also plunged deeply into later German philosophy, and his friend, R. H. Hutton, who was with him, pleasantly tells how in the depths of a German winter with "feet incased in *einhut*" they toiled in a fruitless chase after Hegel's "pure being and pure nothing." Together also they toiled over the more luminous page of Plato. He found it of great advantage to pursue Greek and German thought together for the light each cast upon the other. He once told a friend that he never understood Aristotle's "Ethics" till he translated it into German in Trendelenburg's class. The result of these studies, however, was something more than a clearer insight into things dark before; *"the metaphysics of the world came home to him."* The defection from English Sensational doctrine which Mill had detected reached to conscious and complete repudiation. In its place he had attained to a spiritual philosophy with which *his key to the universe was won.*

III.

We come now to a closer view of the man and his work. However wanting in popular interest may be the labors of a scholar and teacher, in his case their summary is impressive. We have noticed a ministry of three years in Dublin; this was succeeded by a ministry of twenty-five years in Liverpool. After the removal of the college to London, keeping appointments with it implied the long journey of four hours thither, and he was at length induced to follow it in the capacity of resident professor. Soon after reaching London, however, he was invited to minister to the congregation at Little Portland Street Chapel, and here for fourteen years he proclaimed his great word. He thus must have entered to his credit forty-two years of clerical service. During the first six years of his London ministry he alternated in the pulpit ministration with John James Tayler, and during the en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tire period he was released from the more conventional requirements of the pastoral office; yet this service of forty-two years, held to his severely faithful standard, would ordinarily be accounted a very creditable life-work. We must add to this, however, forty-five years as college professor, and that, too, in the most toilsome of departments, dealing with the problems of Aristotle and Kant, and holding himself in readiness to take up the gauntlet that any Mill or Mansel might throw down. Here is a second long and toilsome career, at the end of which, though with nothing else to his credit, he surely might have rested from his labors without apology. To these labors as clergyman and teacher, however, we must add a literary achievement hardly less than the twenty volumes which give ample testimony to the genius and diligence of Carlyle. Some of his volumes are the outcome of pulpit and professorial labors; yet the standard of their execution could hardly have been higher had their production been the sole occupation of his life. This three-fold record places him, of course, among the phenomenal workers of his age. With it in view, question as to his resource were like question as to the strength of Atlas when poising the globe on his shoulders.

Our interest in the Corliss engine, however, is not satisfied when we are merely told its gross achievement; we want also to be told of the interior working of its wonderful machinery. Turning to Dr. Martineau with the like inquiry, we mark, first, an acquisitive power that was very extraordinary. In this endowment nature made provision for a scholar of the first order. His intellectual cleverness was remarkable for its many-sidedness. That law of compensation through which we look to see a man sacrificed on one side to any special aptitude on another, which made Prescott a poor mathematician and Spencer an indifferent linguist, seems to have overlooked him. Whether dealing with the calculus or a Greek chorus, he was congenially occupied; in the fields of inductive inquiry he was at home; he laid hold upon the problems of philosophy as if a Plato come again; literature, art, music, were his solace; on details of archæology, history, political and social institutions, creeds, ecclesiasticisms, his grasp was firm. To these many aptitudes he brought a catholicity to match: a man of most decided convictions, as a scholar he was absolutely without antipathies. Hence the exhaustive knowledge of his problems that made him so formidable an antagonist. The champion of a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spiritual philosophy, he yet could turn upon modern naturalism the edge of its own weapons; a Protestant of Protestants, he could have instructed the College of Cardinals in church legislation; of the school of Baur, he made his own the whole arsenal of orthodox criticism; a follower of Channing, he steeped himself in Athanasius and St. Augustine; the most ultra of nonconformists, he put on the amplest equipment for Archbishop of Canterbury—except the creed of the Church of England. This great endowment was backed by the scholar's tireless diligence; it was backed also by the scholar's care. Like Thoreau, it would have been possible for him to "leave a Greek accent slanting the wrong way and right up a fallen man;" but the man set upon his feet, he would surely have returned to his Greek accent whose mistaken slant could not have left his memory.

The strength of the strong man is seen not merely in the load he carries, but also in the manner in which he carries it. A massive erudition may suggest an "ass of Parnassus," an often useful, but a relatively ignoble animal, which of all things Dr. Martineau was not. For, secondly, while it is given the mere scholar to think as learner, it was given Dr. Martineau to learn as thinker: this power of acquisition was associated with a more characteristic power of reflection. Hence his learning, however rapidly gained, was scarcely less rapidly taken into the mould of his thought. Here we probably meet the supreme proof of a great scholar, in that a rapidly gained knowledge may be at once transformed from pabulum into light. Compare Dr. Martineau, for instance, with Theodore Parker, who as confidently as the youthful Bacon might have taken all knowledge for his province, but who failed in the test here provided. He acquired with a readiness scarcely less wonderful than the miracles he repudiated; but he did not assimilate so readily, and something like intellectual congestion was the consequence. Of this nothing in Dr. Martineau. A new truth gained meant at once new lustre to his torch.

We speak of him as thinker; thinkers, however, are not all of one order. Dr. Martineau was distinctly a logician; that is to say, he was not a diviner. His intellectual affinity was with Mill, not Emerson; he was philosopher, not seer. Of course visions were given him; we note the nature of the receptacle into which they came. He educed conclusions; he did not announce

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oracles. Indeed, there is chance to suspect that from the strength of his logical sensibility it was possible for him to fail of due appreciation where there was conspicuous want of it. Thus, of his great contemporaries, Emerson seems least of all to have moved him. He recognized the genius of Emerson, but it is doubtful if he was quite happy in that *per saltum* by which our seer reached stars indeed, but left no clear track by which to follow after him. There is, however, a peculiar charm in his logic. It seems his life rather than his rule; by it his structure grows rather than is builded. The structures of great logicians are apt to suggest the carpenter, whose building may be imposing, but the careful jointings of which are plainly manifest. Dr. Martineau's structure suggests rather an immanent reason, which works so and not otherwise. It is ever in union, too, with an intrepid daring, an intense conviction, from which it becomes not merely logic, but "logic on fire," which Demosthenes defined eloquence to be.

To these gifts add a vivid and creative imagination, a genius for outline and boundary, the clearest ethical perception, a delight in mystic contemplation, and we have before us his more salient intellectual features.

Such were his powers; let us bring more definitely before us the labors to which he applied them. As we have seen, soon after entering upon his work as a clergyman, he appeared in the field of letters as a critic; and from this time on, till he ceased from toil, critical tasks were rarely far from him. His first effort in this field was a copious and brilliant discussion of Joseph Priestley in the *Monthly Repository* for 1833; his last was a searching critique of Balfour's "Foundations of Belief" in the *Nineteenth Century* for 1895, the frosts of ninety winters on his brow. What in this species of labor he accomplished between these periods the five ample volumes of his miscellaneous papers in the main will show. We say in the main, for other papers numerous and excellent are yet buried in the English quarterlies, where, because he left them, we trust they will be permitted to remain.

These papers represent the interludes between the calls of the severely taxed clergyman and the hardly less severely taxed college professor. He usually produced two or three a year, careful studies of the new teacher, or of the old teacher in whom was a fresh interest—the philosophy, ethics, theology, ecclesiasticism,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which was the vogue of discussion. The names of some of those whom he brought before his critical tribunal—Arnold, Channing, Parker, Coleridge, Newman, Schleiermacher, Lessing, Comte, Mill, Bain, Spencer, Hamilton, Mansel, Strauss, Renan—indicate how vast were the problems at which he toiled in the way of popular presentation. Of these papers it is difficult to say too much. There is, indeed, at times a severity in their tone we might be willing to mitigate; and in general he who was approved at Dr. Martineau's judgment-seat needed to have no dread of Rhadamanthus. If, however, his dialectic was without mercy, he ever bore himself with the grace of a royal courtesy; Macaulay himself did not surpass him in the eloquent concentration of learning; wherever we turn to him his grasp is large and firm, his analysis is profound, he abounds in incisive suggestion; however abstract his argument it is illumined from his imagination and glows with the fervor of his conviction, and at the foot of every page we might write the boast of the youthful Cicero, *"Nihil huc nisi perfectum ingenio, elaboratum industria."*

There is another species of criticism at which Dr. Martineau has toiled. It is that re-creative sort, illustrated by the geologist when, finding a fossil bone, he fashions from it an animal or fish, and then transforms the environment—rears a forest or floods with the sea—to give the creature a congenial habitat. In dealing with ancient records there is demand for the like faculty; and one who will note the success with which Dr. Martineau has employed it may ponder a few pages of his last great book, "The Seat of Authority in Religion." It may well be that many of the judgments of this volume are not final. It deals with problems of long standing, on which it would not be difficult to summon a score of critics of large and profound erudition who would differ widely from Dr. Martineau, and hardly less widely one from another. Perhaps, too, a comparison of their works with his would make clearer than any language can the special power of which we tell. Critical discussions of the New Testament, bristling with scriptural quotations and abounding in other learned *data,* may be very useful to the scholar; but, unless they have received the vivifying touch of genius, they can hardly be interesting to the untrained reader. That touch Dr. Martineau succeeds in imparting. Volumes in this line as learned may not be far to find; but the volumes are few indeed so abounding in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

critical detail and so exhaustively argued that are so enthralling in their interest. Its scholarship, of course, only the scholar can test, and the significance of much of its reasoning only those trained in such studies can fully measure; yet it has been read by multitudes, of untrained mind, who have been held to its great page by a spell it cast upon them. The explanation of this is the fact that the page is not a dead chronicle nor a pulseless argument, but a living and a kindling word.

One of the wonderful facts respecting this volume is the period of life in which it was written. With the exception of the earlier chapters, which had done service in an American periodical, it was all written after eighty-three years of age. Few indeed are the instances in which the "gulf stream of youth" has flowed so far into life's "arctic regions."

From the critic we turn to the moral philosopher. His guiding principle as such was a moral sense than which Bishop Butler's was not clearer. For a long time we had known through his sermons and occasional writings that his ethical discernments were especially acute, also that in his ethical theories he did not follow with the ascendant schools; but it was not till 1885 that, with the publication of the "Types of Ethical Theory," we saw his system in its fulness. This work placed him at once among the first ethical teachers of our century.

Respecting this work we can indulge ourselves but a word. Ethical systems, though many, are reducible to two cardinal types: one of which finds its primary *data* in the universe, the other in man. One may seize upon and unfold some theory of the universe; this shall imply a theory of man; and to this theoretical man certain principles of conduct may be shown by which he may live in harmony with this theoretical universe. Such was the procedure of Comte, of Plato, of Spinoza. This man of theory, however, is not sure to wear a look of verisimilitude. The man of Comte, for instance, placed in comparison with actual men, is fairly suggestive of an anthropological freak. There are features of the inner life that must be known at first hand or not at all. Freedom is not deducible, conscience is no issue of syllogisms; and an ethical doctrine that does not embrace these in its *data* cannot speak home to them in its conclusion.

This limitation Dr. Martineau clearly sees, and devotes his first volume to its exposure. In its ample page he conclusively

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shows that by this method, *"Unpsychological,"* as he calls it, no satisfactory ethic can be won.

With the second volume he takes his departure from man. These inner principles which cannot be deduced from the universe are *data* with which he begins; and from them he elaborates a system of *"Psychological"* doctrine which is his own. Of the wealth of thought and fervid eloquence of this section of his work it were vain to attempt to tell. It is not alone a thinker's conclusion, but also a prophet's burden. From a study of the "springs of conduct" he comes upon a law that rules within them, which to him is the moral law, dimly discerned in man's earlier stages, yet ever coming into clearer light, and only in obedience to which is he moral. Besides these two types he finds a third. His own doctrine is purely psychological; in the field of controversy there is a competitor, which is mixed-psychological, or, as he calls it, *"Hetero-psychological."* It also sets out with the springs of conduct, but, instead of allowing them a law within themselves, it puts them under the direction of an ulterior end, as pleasure or welfare. Dealing with this, he passes critical judgment upon the hedonistic and utilitarian doctrines of Bentham and Mill and Spencer; and these great teachers were never brought to a more searching arraignment. In a later section of the work he reviews the ethical theories of Cudworth and Clarke and Shaftesbury and Hutcheson. In this vast tract of discussion there is hardly an important phase of ethical doctrine that is not exhibited except the Hegelian, but with this no student of this work can doubt his ability to deal.

Next, his contribution to religious philosophy; and here we deal with the immortal "Study of Religion." This work is probably his crowning achievement. With its publication in 1888, he was hailed without distinction of sect or school the foremost defender of fundamental truth. Some, though accustomed to discriminate in their praise, went further than this. An American student, visiting London, found himself one day confronting R. H. Hutton in the office of the *Spectator*. Conversation came round to this work, and Mr. Hutton said, with emphasis: "Dr. Martineau is the greatest philosopher of religion that uses the English language to-day." Not satisfied with this, he continued: "More than that, he is the greatest philosopher of religion that ever has used the English language." The American, willing to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

see how far appreciation would go, interjected here, "Except Bishop Butler." Mr. Hutton, emphasizing his utterance with thumps upon the table, answered, "Not—excepting—Bishop—Butler!" We hear much of the perversion of human judgment from religious antagonism, and Mr. Hutton and Dr. Martineau had the Thirty-nine Articles between them. In this case it seems clear that what the unchurched thinker showed the churchman did not fail to see.

This work in its central feature is a wrestle with the theistic problem. The first question is the perennial one, What is the source of the phenomenal universe? Dr. Martineau seizes upon the idea of cause, and, bidding good-by to Kant and the positivists alike, makes this the clue to the great inquiry. Of his study we can state only results. His first conclusion is that cause implies the origination of phenomena by power. But what is power? We are acquainted with it in the multifarious dynamic of the world, in its forces or agents, as we used to call them, but which we have now learned to be modes of one energy. But, in its ultimate nature, what is this one energy? Inquire as we will through the mere observing faculties, we gain no answer. These modes perform their part openly enough, but the essence which they manifest they also veil. But, failing in my search without, I may turn within. Where the idea of cause is given its nature may be declared; and so Dr. Martineau finds. But cause, as I exercise it, and as interpreted from my centre, is *will*. Where the idea of cause is given, the volitional stamp is set upon it. Meaning this at home, it can have no other meaning when I go abroad: the causal power we contemplate is Will. This glowing and throbbing universe is enchanted by an immanent Will. This conclusion, however, is purely speculative; the next question is, Does the universe ratify it? Do we see in the universe clear tokens of a directing Will? To this inquiry Dr. Martineau turns, and the result of his study is a sublime teleology.

Thus he reaches the first requirement of theistic faith, but there is another. Grant a Will in the universe, is there a Righteousness, too? As before he found his clue in the causal intuition, so now in the moral. There is in man a moral law which he knows to have rightful disposal of him. Whence comes it? Dr. Martineau is philosopher, not advocate; and holds no judgment safe until competing judgments have been found in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

valid. His conclusion, therefore, that this law is given by a Person who has rightful sovereignty over us, and whose inmost spirit it declares is as cogent to the reason as satisfying to the heart. But again the question, Does the universe ratify? Is the moral law within me reflected in the constitution of things around me? If conscience declares a Righteousness, there is the dark experience of evil, and can the two be reconciled? In the full meaning of the word, No. Dr. Martineau himself affirms that the "phenomena of life are disappointing to our ideal of a moral administration of affairs." Yet he who will see the most comforting conclusions that sound reasoning has yet justified may turn to his luminous and inspiring page.

Finally, the office in which the critic and moralist and philosopher met in the "bard of the Holy Ghost," that of the preacher. Dr. Martineau was a very effective preacher, but hardly a popular one. He never drew great congregations, though most select. His manner was too undramatic to lay a spell upon the popular mind; and even with the manner and the tones of Whitefield he could hardly have drawn the multitude with such sermons as he habitually gave. Their depths were too deep, their heights too high. To some who read that the "common people heard Him gladly," and remember how the uncommon people have found life in His word, this may imply an adverse criticism. In the experience of His apostles, however, common and uncommon have needed to be treated differently. Certainly the discourses in "Endeavors" and "Hours of Thought" would have been unsuited to the hillside where Whitefield preached, and the exhortations that brought the colliers to repentance would have evoked feeble response from the congregations to which Dr. Martineau ministered. But his style—we hear it said that it was not suited to pulpit service. It was a style of great strength and beauty; but it is doubtless true that even for cultivated intellects it would have been more effective if less imaginative—above all, could he have been more moderate in the use of metaphor. His beauties are exceedingly beautiful, but their profusion is excessive. You linger to admire a pearl and a shower of diamonds falls around you. Even the reader is often bewildered by the swift succession of splendors, and how much more frequently must have been the hearer. To be thus lost may be not without compensations, but, in thought as in life, to lose the way is to fail of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

destiny. Lost in a garden is lost. Lost amid Sierra glories is lost.

In the peculiarity of their structural principle his sermons are again distinguished from the popular discourse. We ask, What end ruled their preparation? We see clearly why Edwards preached his terrible sermons: there were souls to save from a perdition to which they were hastening. So upon the sermon of almost every preacher is impressed the end it is intended to realize. With Dr. Martineau's sermons it is otherwise. They are not doctrinal—what was his Christology, how he viewed inspiration, why he was a Unitarian, he must be a sharp-eyed critic who can discern in his pulpit utterances. Neither, in the ordinary meaning of the word, are they practical. Practical they are, as fresh air and sunshine, as poetry and art and music are practical; but not practical as addressed to specific needs. They lead into a realm of elevated thought; yet, however they may stimulate or comfort or constrain us, they do not seem to be spoken to us. And they are not spoken to us. Their aim is not address, but self-utterance; not to move another's soul, but to tell the raptures of his own. He looks not about his congregation to discover what they had need to hear, but within himself to find what God has given him to say. He has hope that his word through his utterance may carry a blessing, but it is the hope of an artist who traces a beauty on the canvas, trusting that another may thrill to its joy. He uses the ordinary form of address, and so makes into sermon what otherwise were psalm. There results from this method a tendency to soliloquy, to rhapsody, beautiful and ennobling, but quite the opposite of that directness of speech by which attention is most easily won and longest held. There comes of it, however, something more. In the sermons of few preachers is there so little lecturing; few there are whose pulpit utterance is so little else than a vessel in which the spirit is offered us. Sermons, like men, must have the defects of their qualities, and it is doubtful if they can publish the oracles of the soul and at the same time be always easy for the intellect to grasp. Pouring out the heart is something different from addressing the understanding; psalm and homily have unlike qualities. There are preachers who deftly blend them, as Channing usually, as Dewey occasionally, as Beecher now and then; but so far as the homily is obtrusive the psalm will be sacrificed, and so far as the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

psalm is overpowering the homily will falter. This suggests a doubt whether, save by Dr. Martineau's method, sermons can ordinarily be produced so charged with religious feeling as his. We give them place in the classic literature of devotion, with the volumes of Taylor and Tauler and à Kempis, and there it is probable they will remain. The manner differs; but through his utterances as through theirs the like heights gleam, the like raptures thrill. The understanding can offer what is understood, the reason can offer reasons; but whoever will speak the oracular word must seek the shrine where oracles are given. This secret of his office Dr. Martineau beyond all contemporary preachers seemed to know; and hence the matchless power with which his sermons speak home to us.

IV.

From his work we turn back to his life, of which there may yet be space for a few illustrative incidents. The first is drawn from his ministry in Dublin. His settlement there was outwardly to his liking. His church had local prominence; it had wealth, in the use of which it was not parsimonious; its congregation was a goodly gathering of earnest souls. Doubtless it had troublesome spirits enough to keep a minister in discipline, yet was he satisfied. His people, too, were satisfied. Though in the pulpit he was no Chrysostom, there was quickening and healing in his word; as he moved among them his presence charmed them; the freshness of youth was on his features, the word of wisdom on his lips, the light of genius in his eye. Yet the relation was shattered on a moral issue in a little more than three years.

He was settled as the associate of a venerable pastor, at whose death, which occurred soon after, he came by natural succession to the full pastoral office. To his surprise, he found that the change implied an addition of £100 to his salary. He was further surprised to learn that it was his share of the *Regium Donum*. *Regium Donum* means Royal Bounty—why should this church be favored with a Royal Bounty? A chapter of English history hitherto unread was opened to him. This Bounty had been first bestowed by Charles II. upon the Presbyterians of Ireland and some of the non-conformist bodies of England, with a view to securing their fealty. It was, therefore, at first of the nature of a bribe, and, seeing it in this aspect, some winced at receiving it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Baxter, for instance, would have nothing to do with it. It had, however, become perpetuated; for a hundred and fifty years this church had received it; it came as the grace of Heaven, and was perhaps the more appreciated because, unlike the grace of Heaven, it was not for all alike. Of course at that late date Dr. Martineau saw in it no bribe; but in its least offensive aspect it was to him a sinecure, which in the court of ethics he could not justify. In his view, too, it was inherently unjust. The bounties of kings are the tax of subjects; through this bounty, therefore, multitudes, as the Catholics about him, were taxed to support a worship in which they could not participate, which they indeed abhorred. In dwelling on this aspect of the case, the event sixty years behind him, there was more than the usual light in those mild blue eyes. His course was soon determined: he could not receive this bounty. Declining it for himself, however, might ultimately mean declining it for his church, which his ethical sense forbade him to do. The church, then, must surrender it, or he and they must part. The sceptic of disinterested virtue must surely find it difficult to make out self-interest here: if he won in the contest he sacrificed £100 annually; if he lost, the church in whose service he wished to continue was the costlier forfeit. The younger members came to his side, and the contest was earnest. His view of the Bounty, however, was new; interest pleaded persuasively; and we see something of the strength of his hold upon his people in the fact that the decision was against by only one vote.

This issue sent him into the intenser life and larger opportunity of Liverpool, whither its story followed him as a certificate of inflexible manliness. His ministry here was attended by but one striking episode, the Liverpool controversy, of which, its fame is so wide, there is no need to tell. But while in parochial relations his career was too successful to be eventful, he moved into an extra-parochial relation in which peace was not so monotonously constant. A tireless student of theology, he soon became a leading theologian, and that of the class that reach only temporary encampments, never a city of destination. Such energy of movement is uncongenial to many spirits, and, first and last, Dr. Martineau was the object of a good deal of distrust from those who were plodding on behind him.

This distrust took the form of an annoying opposition to his appointment to the professorship in Manchester New College. In

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intellect and character all recognized his eminent fitness, but he was suspiciously familiar with thought in that land of theological chimeras, Germany. He was known to have studied the Tübingen school, and to have found somewhat to favor in its doctrines. For a time in the constituency of the college there was a very prevalent *Germano-phobia,* a *rabies* of which we have had experience in America also. The opposition amounted to an inquisition for heresy, to him extremely annoying. Had the decision been against him, it is not improbable that he had sought a field of labor in this country. The decision, however, was in his favor; and the contention proved like a summer tempest, after which all nature smiles again.

His life in London was even less attended by striking incident. It was a life of most strenuous toil; but one day at the college was like another, one Sunday at the chapel simply renewed the high inspirations of other Sundays, the occasional address or paper was but a variety of a customary greatness. As at Liverpool his relations became extra-parochial, so here they became extra-denominational: he moved into that realm where scholar and thinker dwell in the largeness and quietude of their vocation. His pleasant home in Gordon Square became a centre of attraction to the great and wise, and around his board or within his library high talk often sped the hour; but we have heard of no Boswell who was also there.

He had a heart experience, of which the old tale that is always new. In his Derby year he became attached to one Helen Higginson, the daughter of a clergyman with whom he boarded. At the end of the year, forecasting the long period of study, their interest in each other came up for consideration. They behaved too sensibly for ideal lovers: she was anything but a Juliet, and he no Romeo. Too young, as it was held, for engagement, it was settled that they should not see each other, or even exchange letters, save at wide intervals till he was ready for his ministry. The probation only proved their constancy, and six years later she became his wife. A baby, Helen, came to them and died in infancy. Their next born was Russell, destined to the scholar's honorable toil and high success. Six other children came to him, of whom four daughters and a son survive him. His heart was gladdened by no grandchildren.

He had that best solace of a man of toil, a home of peace.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Through wifely tenderness and filial piety his heart was satisfied. The sunniest paths, however, lead under shadows. When he gave up the pulpit charge in Little Portland Street Chapel his health seemed declining, and it was hoped that release from its labors would restore him, but it failed to do so. Weakness grew upon him; a melancholy crept into his countenance; the elasticity departed from his step. He kept at his appointed tasks, but the old vigor was gone. The explanation was that the comforter and counsellor of the many years was sinking beside him, and, through her hold on his affections, was drawing him after her. At length, in 1877, after a lingering malady, she died. After her death there came to him a renewal of life.

Honors were slow in coming, but at last they came. In 1872 Harvard crowned him LL.D. Two years later Leyden gave him an S.T.D. Somewhat later Edinburgh honored him with D.D. Yet later, Oxford smiled upon him with D.C.L. Last of all, Dublin bore testimony with Litt.D. In 1872 he was given a testimonial of a different sort, which must have been very gratifying. At the close of the college session an interview was sought with him and a cheque for 5,000 guineas was placed in his hand with intimation that more was to come. This sum was soon raised to £5,900, a portion of which, with his consent, was used in the purchase of some pieces of silver plate, which were nobly inscribed. The gift was from various friends and admirers, and was accompanied by an address, in which its prompting was referred to "mingled motives of gratitude, respect and affection." On his retirement from the Little Portland Street Chapel, his flock presented to him £3,500, also from motives of gratitude, respect and affection.

In 1888 he received another testimonial than which it were difficult to conceive a prouder. It was planned as a greeting for his eighty-third birthday, and reflected the admiration with which his recently published "Study of Religion" was welcomed. It was an address signed by leading scholars and thinkers of Europe and America, without regard to religious or philosophical bias. After passing through various hands, it received its final touch from Professor Jowett. In it was this passage: "We admire the simple record of a long life passed in the strenuous fulfilment of duty, in preaching, in teaching the youth of both sexes, in writing books of permanent value, a life which has never been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

distracted by controversy, and in which personal interests and ambitions have never been allowed a place." The signatures, between six and seven hundred in number, together with the address, were presented in a book of surpassing elegance. The first signature was that of Tennyson, the next was that of Browning; following these were the names of Jowett, Bradley, Zeller, Max Müller, Lubbock, Renan, Kuenen, Pfleiderer; of members of Parliament and Church dignitaries in long array; of illustrious representatives of the universities of England, France, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, America; of men of letters, theologians, philosophers, of all schools. Party distinctions were lost to view in the common recognition of a common benefactor.

In reply, Dr. Martineau happily drew to himself the language of Cicero: *"Est ea profecto jucunda laus, qui ab iis proficiscitur, qui ipsi in laude vixerunt."* Here we will leave him. Of his later toil we have already told; we will not intrude upon his later rest. Ours his strenuous day, not the quiet of his evening. We part with him as with a leader whom we have followed, on the field of his pride and valor.

A. W. JACKSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MISUNDERSTOOD JAPAN.

BY Y. OZAKI.

EVEN in civic life, the source of a great proportion of the quarrels that constantly take place between individual citizens must be sought, not so much in original sin or in the perversity of human nature, as in mere misunderstandings. And, in international relations, this proposition holds true to an equal, if not to a greater, extent. Even between the United States and Great Britain, with a common language and a great community in legal and other institutions, mere misunderstandings have, time and again, jeopardized the friendly intercourse of the two great Anglo-Saxon powers; while, between the various countries of Europe, "strained relations" have been frequently occasioned by nothing more serious than the inability of one nation, or one government, to put itself at the point of view of the other. If such be the case, then, with a family of nations having a common culture and a common civilization, it is, perhaps, not so much to be wondered at that Japan, the latest power to enter the comity of nations, and the only non-Christian, and (except Hungary) the only non-Aryan, power within its pale, should be viewed with a certain amount of suspicion.

And so it is not unnatural that, perhaps, in this matter of being misunderstood, Japan has more reason to complain than any other nation in modern times. For it is not by Western powers only that she has been misinterpreted. The mere fact of her breaking away from the thraldom of the old Oriental civilization was in itself sufficient to excite the dislike and the distrust of her immediate neighbors, China and Korea. To this dislike both nations gave expression in a fashion that was anything but soothing to Japan's *amour propre;* the attitude assumed toward her by Chinese and Koreans alike having been exasperatingly arrogant

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and overbearing. If they had had any approximately accurate notions about Japan's capabilities as a military power, it is just possible that the war of 1894-5 would have been avoided. But, as they utterly failed to appreciate her efforts generally, they wantonly persisted in the arrogant line of action that brought about the struggle of six years ago. The struggle in question was none of Japan's seeking; however, her own self-respect demanded that these perpetual and persistent misunderstandings of her and her motives by her neighbors should be cleared up once for all.

Nor was it the Chinese Government only that had its misconceptions corrected by the late war. At the inception of the strife, a good many foreigners expressed themselves to the effect that Japan, having found a new toy in her army and navy, merely wished to play with it. Nothing succeeds like success, and even anticipated success commands a certain amount of respect. Now, almost every Westerner fully anticipated a Chinese triumph in the long run; and hence, in the main, foreign sympathy at first was almost entirely with the Middle Kingdom. But with the capture of Port Arthur and, later on, of Wei-hai-wei, and with the destruction or capture of the formidable Chinese fleet, there was a sudden revulsion of feeling abroad, and we Japanese—somewhat to our cost, be it remarked—had a full opportunity of appreciating the truth of the maxim that action and re-action are equal and opposite. In August, 1894, Japan was regarded as a spoiled child, wantonly bent on amusing herself with her newly devised toy army and navy; in April, 1895, she found herself regarded with apprehension as a formidable military power, whose aggressive propensities were a deadly menace to the peace of the Far East. Hence the intervention of the three Powers, and their "advice" in the matter of retrocession of the Liao-tung Peninsula to China. In 1894, our strength had been ludicrously underestimated; six months later, we found ourselves honored by being "advised" by the strongest coalition of European powers that had been formed since Waterloo and the sending of Napoleon to St. Helena. And, in sooth, it would seem that some of the most influential statesmen in Europe deemed that more than the peace of the Far East was in danger of being disturbed by Japan's aggressive proclivities. Shortly after the Treaty of Shimonoseki, appeared the German Kaiser's famous cartoon: "Nations of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe! Defend your holiest possessions!" Defend *from whom?* To answer this question is not easy for a Japanese. The simple fact of the matter is, that in the spring of 1895 Japan found herself as much misunderstood as she had been before the war, albeit the misunderstanding was in an opposite direction. Her ambitions and her potentialities were vastly exaggerated by Western politicians and publicists, to whom her latent strength had suddenly appeared as a sort of revelation.

Again, perhaps no country in the world has suffered so much, directly or indirectly, at the hands of the imaginative bookmaker and magazine writer as Japan. Of course, no really great work, whether in literature, science, art or statecraft, can be accomplished without the exercise of constructive imagination. But constructive imagination invariably keeps in touch with realities. However, imagination in the popular use of the word is often synonymous with unreality, and it is in this sense of the term that Japan has only too good reason to complain of the, no doubt, well-meant but fatal efforts of the imaginative writer. Certain authors, notably Sir Edwin Arnold, have painted Japan as a terrestrial Paradise, inhabited by a race of charming and guileless and painfully polite angels, endowed with consummate æsthetic taste; as a land where every prospect pleases, without the drawback of even the slightest tincture of vileness among its humanity. This is a well-intentioned but serious misrepresentation; and, naturally enough, we have had to pay for the untruth in the picture. This fashion of writers aroused the spleen of other writers, who have exerted themselves to correct the error by limning Japan and the Japanese in the blackest of colors. Of course, the truth lies midway; in the matter of virtue and vice, average Japanese human nature lies much closer to average European and American human nature than is generally supposed. In short, *vis à vis* to Europe and America, Japan thinks it utterly unjust that there should be "one law for me and another for thee."

And yet, indications are not altogether lacking that even our very best friends, the Americans, do actually hold some such heterodox doctrine. Forty-seven years ago, the Americans thrust themselves upon Japan at the cannon's mouth. It is quite true that at that time Commodore Perry expended no ammunition in hostilities; but it is equally true that, if the Commodore had not been backed up by the moral suasion of his armament, Japan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would not then have agreed to open her ports to foreign intercourse. And now, after thrusting themselves upon Japan by *force majeure* in 1853, we find Americans trying to exclude Japanese from the United States! I may remark that, in common with most intelligent Japanese, I am totally opposed to Japanese emigration as at present conducted, and that on three grounds. In only too many cases, the peasants are decoyed by the agents of emigration companies, who have no thoughts beyond the amount of the dividends they declare. In the second place, the uneducated peasant is but ill-equipped to fight the battle of life in a foreign land. And, in the third place, emigration on a large scale might very easily involve Japan in unnecessary diplomatic complications with friendly powers—a thing which her statesmen are especially anxious to avoid. But, with all that, it yet remains true that the present attitude of a certain section of the American people toward Japanese emigrants argues a certain lack of acquaintance with, or a certain misunderstanding of, the history of the intercourse between the two countries. It is bootless to urge that, while only low-class Japanese enter the United States, only respectable Americans go to Japan. The very first instance of Japan's being called upon to exercise her recovered jurisdiction was when she had to try, convict and execute an all but illiterate American citizen for the murder of another American citizen and two Japanese women in Yokohama, on the very night when the new treaty between the two powers went into operation. This attitude toward Japanese emigrants, then, mainly arises from a failure to recall the history of our relations with the United States, and from the consequent misapprehension of our point of view. But this misunderstanding, such as it is, is no very serious one; and in this case, doubtless, a *modus vivendi* can readily be found.

But, in other far more vital directions, Japan at present stands in danger of being gravely misunderstood. Now, misunderstanding, as I have said, is invariably the fruitful parent of mistakes that may cause the most serious losses and disasters to all involved. Thus, to do even a little to clear up a misunderstanding, or a possible misunderstanding, is work of no small merit. Now, while Japan is honestly anxious to have misunderstandings with no country, there are two Powers, especially, toward whom it behooves her to be exceedingly frank. It is needless to say that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these two Powers are Great Britain and Russia. In the Chinese and Korean questions, the interests of all three Powers are closely involved; and, on these questions, anything like a misunderstanding between Japan and either of the two European nations would be nothing short of a calamity to all three. With both Great Britain and Russia, Japan must endeavor to keep on as friendly terms as the Great American Republic does. This may seem a hard task for Japan; but, on a review of all the factors in the situation, it will appear much less difficult than may appear at first.

As regards our relations with Great Britain, for several years they have been, and at present they are, excellent. We do not forget the friendly attitude of Sir Henry Parkes toward the Imperial Government immediately before, during and after the Restoration of 1868. The English language has been the chief medium through which Japanese have become acquainted with Western science, although in this matter Japan owes quite as much to America as to Great Britain. Intelligent Japanese have a sincere and honest admiration for the freedom of British institutions, for the orderly and law-abiding instincts of the British people, and for the high tone and purity of British public life. Then, our navy has been largely formed on British lines, and the relations between British and Japanese officers have always been the very best. For the courtesy shown them on their frequent visits to England, our officers and blue-jackets alike have the keenest appreciation. The islanders of the East and the islanders of the West have this much in common, at least—the instincts of both are maritime. All these considerations, of course, are mainly sentimental; and so, perhaps, is our feeling toward England for having agreed to a revised treaty before a single shot was fired in our war with China, and also for the holding aloof from the coalition of April, 1895. But Japan is rapidly becoming a trading and commercial country; and the knowledge that, wherever the British flag flies, no discriminatory tariff will have to be faced by Japanese traders enables England to extort from Japan a regard that is not sentimental merely. Now, British interests in China and Korea are purely commercial and industrial, and British commercial policy being what it is, no clash between British and Japanese interests in these two countries is at all likely. And outside of these two countries (save perhaps in British Columbia),

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there is nothing that can possibly disturb the present excellent relations between the two island powers.

With respect to Japan's relations with Russia, the situation may well appear to be not quite so simple. Yet, I venture to assert that, even here, all that is needed to make these relations thoroughly satisfactory is a little honest, straightforward speaking. I am quite well aware that the American press regards the situation as being so tense that war is inevitable, and that certain of the more enterprising journals have dispatched correspondents to the scene of probable hostilities.* But where are the causes of any such hostilities? They can lie only in mutual misunderstandings.

The Russians are quite well aware of the spirit in which the Japanese took their intervention in 1895. Naturally enough, to have been constrained to relinquish the spoils of victory, on that occasion, was not altogether pleasing to Japan. It is needless to deny that the popular resentment then roused was intense. But, in Japan, passionate outbursts are readily excited and as readily allayed. In this respect, we are very different from the Russians, who read their own nature into ours. They regard us as a people at once exceedingly vindictive and exceedingly tenacious of purpose. As a matter of fact, we are neither the one nor the other. In intelligent and influential circles, resentment soon gave way to reflection, and reflection made it clear that Russia's desire for an ice-free port, as an outlet to her vast extent of territory in the Far East, was no unreasonable one. So when she "leased" Port Arthur and Talienwan, Japan entered no protest and made no movement whatsoever—a fact which in itself ought to help to convince the Muscovites of our peaceful intentions and easy-going temper. But the Russians evidently fail to understand our nature and our aspirations, such as they are. If they did, we should not have those evidences of renewed Russian activity in Korea which we have had of late. This activity has, no doubt, been prompted by the wish to find in Korea a cover against the attack on Manchuria, which the Russians very mistakenly fancy Japan is meditating. "Mistakenly," I say advisedly; for all intelligent Japan-

*One of these gentlemen has succeeded in tickling the sense of humor and exciting the risibilities of Japanese who read English by his discovery of a wonderful mare's nest. The Daimios are hoarding gold! Presumably as a war fund to fight Russia with! The gentleman in question is either something of a humorist himself, or has been the victim of some one of the not innumerous humorists—conscious or unconscious—of Tokyo.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ese now frankly acknowledge that the possession of Port Arthur and Talienwan is a vital necessity to Russia.

But, while frankly acknowledging that fact, thinking Japanese are equally convinced that, if Japan is to feel actually secure, Korea must be left severely alone by Russia. The little Peninsular Empire, if it really can govern itself and keep its own household in order, as all Japanese have sincerely hoped it will be able to do, must have its independence guaranteed and maintained. In the case of its failure to emerge from the semi-barbaric chaos that at present prevails at Seoul, then it must have Japan's protection. Put briefly, the case is this: We frankly recognize that her new possessions in Manchuria are a vital necessity to Russia, and, consequently, we have no earthly intention of interfering with her in them. But, on the other hand, it is of equal moment to Japan that the Muscovites should hold aloof from Korea. If so much is clearly understood, all reasons for friction and possible conflict between Japan and Russia disappear.

However, if the Great Northern Power is really bent on establishing herself in the erstwhile Hermit Kingdom, and so threatening our defenses, no friendly intercourse between Japan and Russia is possible. Any such attempt on her part will surely be provocative of hostilities, just as surely as any attempt of ours to oust her from Port Arthur would lead to dire and prolonged conflict. And, whether from a Japanese or a Russian point of view, any such conflict would be at once utterly meaningless and utterly profitless. Suppose Japan victorious by land and sea, and suppose that the Japanese war flag once again floats triumphantly over the defenses and dock-yards of Port Arthur. Is it either right or reasonable to deny Russia all approach to the ice-free seas in this part of the world? Of one thing we may be quite sure, and that is, that the persistent Muscovite Government would not sit down and tamely submit to such a condition of affairs for any great length of time. The result would be a state of perpetual war between the two countries, and this, of course, would be good for neither of them.

Suppose, on the other hand, that Russia either openly annexes Korea, or acquires a political predominance there which virtually converts the peninsula into a dependency of hers. This the Japanese will unfailingly construe as a deadly menace to the safety of Japan, and the result here, too, would be a state of perpetual

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

warfare. The Japanese are a contented, easy-going people so long as they feel secure in their own beloved land, which they believe to be the finest in the whole world, and which they love with passionate devotion. But, once let them feel insecure in their own adored country, and this easy-going nation becomes even as a lion attacked in his lair. Then they would fight to the death; Krüger's assertion, that "the burghers will never surrender so long as five hundred armed men remain together," would be found to be no mere empty boast in our case. The historical tradition exercises a potent influence upon the spirit of our people. These islands, in their long history of two millenniums and a half, have never submitted to a foreign yoke for even a single day. With good reason we can appropriate the vaunt put by England's greatest poet into the mouth of the valiant Bastard in *King John:*

> "Da Nipon never did, nor never shall
> Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Come the three corners of the world in arms
> And we shall shock them."

That is, if either our independence or our sense of security be menaced. And Russian predominance in Korea would certainly be regarded as a dire menace to the security of Japan. As I have said, such a situation could have only one outcome, a perpetual state of warfare between the two nations.

Now, in either case, whether we assail the Russians in the occupation of Manchuria, or whether the Russians menace our security by an endeavor to clutch Korea—neither Japan nor Russia can hope to gain much in the long run. If hostilities did break out, the war would be worse than fruitless and barren, even for the immediate victor in the strife. Even for Japan this would be so, and Japan has practically no interests in other parts of the world that would have to suffer during the prosecution of hostilities. And the strife would be even more unprofitable to Russia, whose frontiers, from the Moorman Coast to the Black Sea and thence on to Manchuria, are in touch with those of some half score of other nations. As Captain Mahon very rightly says, "upon one flank of the Russian line lies the army of Japan, upon the other, 5,000 miles away, that of Germany." During the prosecution of these hypothetical hostilities with Japan, Russia must remain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quiescent elsewhere, and her interests will, meanwhile, suffer at numerous points. Nor is this consideration altogether an *a priori* one. At the time of the intervention of the three Powers, Prince Lobanoff interested his diplomatic agents in Europe and the Near East, in Great Britain, Germany, Persia and elsewhere to avoid all possible complications. And, since the outbreak of the South African war, England has been careful to avoid all kinds of diplomatic complications with other Powers. So, on the whole, in the case of any struggle over Korea, Russia would risk much more than Japan would be called upon to jeopardize. Briefly, then, the case stands thus: Japan fancies that Russia has designs on Korea; Russia believes that Japan meditates a stroke at Russia's new possessions in Manchuria. Neither supposition may be correct—certainly the second is absolutely incorrect; the two nations misunderstand each other. If the two nations do cherish any such intentions, let us promptly renounce them, for they are not merely foolish but positively insane. No nation can live in peace without the possession of what is a vital necessity to it.

History shows that the Russian advance has invariably been along the line of least resistance. Now that this line of least resistance does not lie in the Korean peninsula, the statesmen at St. Petersburg must know perfectly well. The Sick Man of the Far East is much nearer dissolution than the Ottoman Empire is, or ever has been. China's malady is mortal. Japan sincerely wishes to see the independence and the integrity of the Middle Kingdom maintained; but the trend of events serves to indicate only too clearly that this is impossible, and that the sand in the hour-glass is running down apace. At the very date that Marquis Tsen penned his extraordinary article on "Sleeping China," some dozen years ago, China was sleepless from mortal disease, and was awaiting her own dissolution with wide open eyes. What was really wanted at the time was the awakening of other nations to the fact, a fact they could not grasp till they were awakened to it by the thunder of the Japanese artillery six years later on. I most sincerely trust that the mistakes and misapprehensions of the past will be a lesson for the future. As long as there is an abundance of meat, even dogs refrain from snarling and fighting, and nations should surely be wiser than dogs.

There is yet one other possible source of misunderstanding to which I must briefly advert. Several foreign statesmen, among

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them Sir Charles Dilke, have maintained that it is necessary for Japan to hold Manchuria to provide an outlet for her surplus population, and that this consideration in itself may lead to a conflict with Russia. This view I hold to be mistaken, and that for two reasons. In the first place, Manchuria is utterly unsuited for Japanese settlement, by reason of its climatic conditions. The winter there is too long and too rigorous. Japanese migration either to Manchuria or to Siberia would be next door to an impossibility, to judge from our experience in Yezo. During the last half-century, we have spared neither brain nor money in our efforts to colonize the northern islands. Although the soil is extremely fertile in many places, although Yezo is as large as the State of Indiana, and although we have spent about Yen 100,000,000 in our efforts to people it, yet in 1898 the population was only a little over 600,000. This means that each settler has cost us about Yen 165—no small sum, if we take into account the fact that our national wealth per head cannot be more than Yen 400. In the second place, Japan will not be confronted with the population question by any means so soon as foreign statesmen and publicists suppose. It is quite true that we find ourselves with some half-million additional mouths to feed every year, an increase of something over one per cent. But our national wealth is augmenting at a very much greater rate. And, even in the mere matter of the necessaries of life, our food supplies are increasing quite as fast as our population. It must not be forgotten that the standard of living here is much lower than it is in the West. Although that is certainly rising apace, yet the wants of the great body of our population are few and simple. To the Japanese farmer, "three acres and a cow" are not at all a vital necessity. With his family he can live pretty comfortably on his 3 *tau* 3 *se* of the old popular song.*

Furthermore, many parts of Japan are not at all densely peopled from our point of view. While the 2,600 square miles around Osaka and Kioto support as many as 1,000 inhabitants per square mile, and the 15,900 around Tokyo and Nagoya as many as 625, the 25,000 square miles at the north of the main island have no greater density than 188 per square mile, while the 36,000 square miles of Yezo carry only 17 per mile. This northern island, with the development of its timber and fishing industries,

* 3,927 square yards, or some four-fifths of an acre.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and with the opening up of its rich coal seams, will yet maintain a large population. I am quite aware that an American expert has estimated that it can never carry more than 3,000,000 inhabitants. Doubtless, if agriculture were to be the only form of industry prosecuted there, this might be true. But, lately, places have been discovered in some three or four different localities, and a "rush" has already set in. Last year, as much as Yen 3,000,000 worth of gold was obtained by the most primitive methods of work. We must remember that it was the discovery of gold that peopled the Australian Colonies and California. Therefore, to expect some day to find the Hokkaido with a population of some six or seven millions may be neither a dream nor an extravagance.

Then, to the south, we have another outlet in Formosa, capable of absorbing some 2,000,000 in addition to the 3,000,000 inhabitants it at present contains. Hitherto, the malarial character of the climate has restrained Japanese emigration in that direction, but the researches of Ross, Manson and some Italian bacteriologists have gone a long way to show that the dread scourge of malaria can be grappled with successfully. So Formosa will yet become densely settled.

But even if Hokkaido and Formosa cannot absorb 9,000,000 more inhabitants, and I maintain they can, yet we have still ample space for many a year in old Japan. Japanese can live much more densely than Westerners can, without any inconvenience to themselves, and small towns are much preferable to lonely villages. And, with the spread of modern manufacturing industries in the North, where in spite of the abundance of coal and water power they are at present practically non-existent, we may confidently expect the rise of a larger number of urban communities there. As regards the present Japanese emigration to America and Australia, what causes it is not the pressure of population at home, but the prospect of higher wages abroad. Even sparsely populated Ireland sends out infinitely more emigrants than does densely peopled Japan.

Thus, from mere pressure of population, we need have no apprehension of being driven into strife with Russia. Where, then, are the causes for any such conflict? They can be found nowhere except in misunderstandings. And it is at once a misfortune to be misunderstood and stupidity to misunderstand.

Y. OZAKI.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"THE DECLINE OF BRITISH COMMERCE," A REPLY.

BY BENJAMIN TAYLOR.

WHEN, at the request of the Editor, I undertook to reply to the article under this heading, which Mr. A. Maurice Low contributed to THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW in October last, it seemed like renewing acquaintance with an old, familiar friend. For as long as I remember we have been accustomed to hear of British decadence, actual or imminent. For certainly five-and-twenty years we have been constantly told that the country is on the down grade in commerce. That period takes us back nearly to the industrial new birth of Germany, back also to a time when the fiscal policy of the United States was much more severely criticised in Great Britain than it is now. The present writer can well recall having then advised, with much presumption, no doubt, British manufacturers not to be so severe on the American tariff, since the break down of the tariff wall and the adoption of Free Trade by America would probably be followed by the destruction of several leading British industries. Well, the quarter-century passed; the United States have not adopted Free Trade, but have built a higher tariff wall than ever; the export trade of America has doubled, and the foreign trade of Great Britain has certainly not diminished. On the contrary, it has increased; and, that it is increasing, the following comparative table of imports and exports during the last five years will show:

FOREIGN TRADE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

	Imports.	Re-exports of Foreign and Colonial Merchandise.	Exports of British Manufactures and Products.
1899	£485,075,514	£65,019,549	£264,660,647
1898	470,378,583	60,654,748	233,359,240
1897	451,028,960	59,954,410	234,219,708
1896	441,808,904	56,233,663	240,145,551
1895	416,689,658	59,704,161	226,128,246

Comparing 1899 with 1895, it will be seen that, in the five years, the imports have increased by £68,385,856; the re-exports

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have increased by £5,315,388; the British exports have increased by £38,532,401; and the whole foreign trade of the United Kingdom has increased by £112,233,645.

There is no evidence of decline in these figures. It is true that, as Mr. Low says, it is misleading to take merely the aggregate of exports and imports in endeavouring to gauge the world's commerce. But I am not at present gauging the world's commerce. I am showing the expansion that has taken place in the commerce of the United Kingdom, at a time when we are told that it is declining. Whatever defects there may be in the barometrical value of these figures, these defects have been the same year by year, and do not affect the comparative value. A foreign trade which has increased by one-sixth in five years does not impress one with a feeling of decay. An increase of upwards of one-sixth in the exports of British manufactures in five years does not look as if the world were getting tired of these manufactures. An increase of £5,315,388 in what may be called the foreign and colonial brokerage trade of Great Britain, does not look as if either German or American enterprise were robbing her of much of that trade—though I am free to confess that this is a branch of trade into which the development of German lines of steamers has made some inroad. But it is a comparatively small branch of our foreign trade—very small compared with the volume of our carrying trade direct between countries beyond the water area of the British Isles.

We have just come through the most industrially active and commercially prosperous year in the annals of British commerce. There have been some years of higher prices; but high prices do not always mean prosperity, and in the inflation and fever-heat of the early seventies no period was so honestly active and so wholesomely prosperous as 1899. In the knowledge of that, and with the evidence of one's senses, one is naturally sceptical about that "decline" of British commerce on which Mr. Low enlarged. If it is decline we are experiencing, we can stand a good deal more of it—and, perhaps, some others viewing it may, like Punch's cabby, wish they had "'alf our complaint."

If, as is the case, British manufacturers and producers have now as much work as they can manage, and are obliged to bargain for time with all fresh work offered to them, how does it matter what is the relative pace of increase of other nations? There

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will come a time of slackening, of course; but it will come to others as well.

What I maintain is that the present condition of the industries and commerce of Great Britain proves the contrary of what Mr. Low asserts—that "England is steadily losing her hold of the world's markets." He uses the word "control" (not "hold"); but England never professed to control, only to supply, the foreign markets. We have never objected to any other country trying to do the same. Other nations erect tariff walls—we offer the open door to all. Stranger things than sending coals to Newcastle have happened during the last quarter of the century now expiring. We have seen American coal in England and American pig-iron in Scotland; although I do not think we have yet seen American linens in Belfast and Dunfermline, or American cottons in Manchester. But these are the mere "sports" of commerce, that do not practically affect the economics of the subject.

Let us look at this matter a little more closely. Mr. Low says: "If during the next twenty-five years Great Britain loses her trade as rapidly as she has during the quarter of a century from 1870 to 1895, she will have yielded her primacy as the greatest of the world's commercial powers." There is much virtue in that "if." I do not admit the correctness of Mr. Low's premises, but I wish to show first the falsity of his conclusions. He says that in 1870 Great Britain did rather more than thirty-five per cent. of the total of the commerce of the great industrial nations, and in 1895 under thirty per cent. This, then, was a loss of five per cent. on Mr. Low's figures, in five-and-twenty years, and a loss at the same rate during the next twenty-five years would leave us still with twenty-five per cent. Now, any one who glances over the list of exporting nations, given by Mr. Low, will perceive that any single nation doing one-fourth of the world's commerce must necessarily hold the first place.

Again, Mr. Low says: "It was because of this loss that the United States in twenty-five years were enabled to more than double their exports, and Germany to increase its exports forty-two per cent., both nations profiting at the expense of Great Britain." Once more I join issue. America and Germany have not benefited at the expense of Great Britain, for British trade has also gone on increasing. They have thriven by obtaining a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

share in the commercial expansion of the world. They are both industrially young, and, as is natural in youth, they have grown rapidly. They will both continue to grow; but he is a rash man who will predict that their growth will be as rapid in the next as in the past twent-five years. They have yet to suffer the pains of adolescence, and to find, as Britain has done, that the path of industrial progress is not all one of roses and rapture. Mr. Low, too, compares the increase in the exports of the United States, which are chiefly natural, with those of Great Britain, which are almost wholly artificial.

As to Germany, Mr. Low takes too much for granted. In order to show that the exports of German products increased 42.90 per cent., he takes the exports of Germany as of the value of £116,031,000 in 1870, and of the value of £165,895,000 in 1895. But the Germany of 1870 was not the Germany of 1895. It is really only since 1871 that Germany has become a new commercial nation. Her industrial *renaissance* dates from the period of unification, and sufficient allowance is not made by rapid commentators for the effect of political on commercial expansion. Under the Empire, a unity of action and concentration of effort previously unattainable became possible. It was Bismarck who sought to crown his political work by making Germany into a great commercial and industrial Empire. But it is impossible to discern how far his design has been achieved by comparing the trade statistics of 1870 with those of 1895, as Mr. Low does. For the commercial unity of the Empire was not affected until seventeen years after the political unity was accomplished—that is, in 1888, when Hamburg and Bremen ceased to be free cities and became absorbed in the Imperial Zollverein. There are, in fact, no complete "German" statistics available before 1889. Nevertheless, Mr. Low makes up a table with a design to prove the relatively greater progress of other nations than Great Britain's between 1870 and 1895; and in that table he states the "special" export trade of Germany as £116,031,000 in the former and £165,895,000 in the latter year. As already pointed out, the figures Mr. Low quotes for 1870 do not include the exports of Hamburg and Bremen, the two principal ports of Germany!

The earliest period at which an unbroken series of statistics permits of a comparison of the trade of the German and the British Empires is from 1889 to 1896. In 1889, the exports of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the domestic products of Germany, forming the so-called "special" trade, amounted to £158,335,000, and in 1896 they amounted to £176,030,200. The difference is an increase of £17,695,200. or, say, eleven and one-half per cent. This is in striking contrast with the £49,814,000, and 42.90 per cent. of Mr. Low's hypothesis. I do not propose to examine the figures he presents for the United Kingdom between 1870 and 1895, but content myself with remarking that he calculates the British increase as 13.17 per cent., while I have shown that the German increase between 1889 and 1896 was barely 11½ per cent. Mr. Low prefaces his comparison by saying: "The reason why the period from 1870 to 1895 was selected, rather than from 1874 to the present time, is that from 1870 dates Germany's commercial *renaissance*." The year of Germany's commercial *renaissance*, however, was 1871, not 1870; but, as I have said, there are no statistics available to permit even an approximate comparison.

The fact which has escaped Mr. Low's notice is that the undoubted and remarkable development of Germany is more marked by the decrease in her imports of foreign manufactures than in the increase in her exports of German manufactures. The growth in German industrial consumption has been greater than the growth in industrial production, as the population increased and settled down to the arts of peace. Between 1889 and 1896, the population of Germany increased by about four millions, and that extra population German producers were able to supply, with less assistance from foreign manufacturers than before. No one can miss the significance of this, but it does not prevent the growth of Britain's foreign trade. Statistics published in Germany show that in 1896 the value of the international "special" trade of the two Empires—Great Britain and British possessions on the one side, and Germany and German possessions on the other—was very nearly the same. The imports from the British Empire into the German Empire amounted to £42,842,350, and the exports to the British Empire from the German Empire amounted to £41,-164,850—a difference of only £1,677,500. And in this conection I quote the following from a report published last year, by Mr. Gastrell, Commercial Attachê to the British Embassy at Berlin:

"A comparison of the total 'special' trade of the United Kingdom and Germany in the three years—1895-97—(after due allowance for the changes in statistics on January 1st, 1899,) shows the following re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sults: For England there are, in 1896 and 1897, rises in the value of imports of £28,827,954 and £6,063,265; and in exports an increase of £14,255,535 in the former year, and a decrease of £5,925,843 in the latter. For the Germans are found in those years increased imports of £9,324,706 and £14,095,194, and for exports a rise of £10,361,500 in 1896, but a slight fall of £226,300 in 1897. The net result of this comparison of the total exports of the two countries is, therefore, in 1897 a balance of £5,699,543 (being £5,925,843 as compared with £226,300) in favor of Germany, on that year's transactions. But this was owing almost entirely to the English loss of £5,248,000 in cotton and cotton goods in that year, a very large part of which was caused by the severe fall in price for the enormous British exports of that commodity."

As regards the development of the German shipbuilding industry, of which one hears so much, it has only been possible so far by placing on the free list all shipbuilding material imported from Great Britain.

A year ago, in reviewing the development of German-American trade, Count Von Posadowsky, Secretary of State for the Interior, recited to the Reichstag a number of interesting figures, chiefly illustrative of the growth of American exports. And then he went on to say:*

"The case of Germany is more unfavorable than that of England. England chiefly imported cereals, cottons and valuable raw material for manufacture, and for the intermediate trade. Germany was already beginning to be seriously affected by American industrial competition. He instanced the textile, iron, steel and shoe-making industries. In the first eight months of the financial year 1897-98 no less than one-third of all the bicycles exported from America were destined for the German market. This was due to the fact that extreme protection in America not only kept up the prices of bicycles in the American market, but also artificially stimulated the bicycle industry there. When a crisis came the superfluous production was thrown on the German market at reduced prices."

In conclusion, Count Von Posadowsky gave the then latest approximate statistics of trade between Germany and the United States.

"American exports to Germany in the calendar year 1898, he reckoned, would be found to have amounted to 852½ million marks, while American imports from Germany had declined to 344 million marks. The balance of German trade with America was thus 518½ million marks against exports, a state of affairs which warranted the German Government in asking that the treaty of 1828 should be enforced in a spirit of fairness."

Now, it does not come within the purpose of this paper to

*I quote from "The Times'" report, February 14th, 1899.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

analyze the trade on which Count Von Posadowsky thus commented—though incidentally I may remark that sugar would account for a good deal of the difference which disturbed him. But it does come within my purpose to show that, if any trade is declining anywhere, it is not British trade alone. Clearly Germany is not gaining in America at our expense.

Next, I take the following from the report of the British Consul-General, Schwabach, on the trade of Germany for 1898:

"I wish here to draw attention to the opinion of a celebrated German national economist, Professor Gombart, who in answer to the question—'will Germany develop into an exporting manufacturing country?'—expressed his opinion that as the exports were certainly diminishing, the development of Germany would take other directions. But opinion on this subject, even among those intimately acquanted with it, is divided. The Essen Chamber of Commerce, for example, in their annual report for 1898, prophesies a standstill, and declares that a further economic development is not to be expected."

And then Consul-General Schwabach goes on to express his own opinion to the effect that:

"The possession of additional markets, the commercial results of the journey of the Emperor to Palestine, the far-seeing policy of German industrial statistics, the appointment of an economic committee in the Ministry of the Interior, the strengthening of the mercantile marine, and last, not least, the increase of the navy; all these circumstances make themselves distinctly felt, and lead one to assume that Germany has not yet reached the high-water mark of her economic development."

Of course not, but on the same page of the consular report from which I have quoted I notice with interest a reference to the flourishing trade between Germany and British India, and a statement that the cause of this increased trade is the Merchandise Marks Act. This was undoubtedly one of the greatest blunders in industrial legislation ever achieved by a British Parliament. It gave away a large part of our foreign trade, by compelling us to tell our customers where we bought the goods, not of our own manufacture, that we sold them. It was good, honest, profitable, mercantile business. There was no earthly reason why a British merchant should not ship cheap German goods to India or Antarctica, if they suited his customers there and he could get a profit on them. And there was no earthly reason why he should tell his customers that the goods were "made in Germany." But an act of Parliament compelled him to tell, and thereupon his customers sent their next orders to Germany direct. This did

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not increase the demand for German goods, nor did it diminish the trade in British manufactures. It simply diverted a portion of our intermediary trade Yet the alteration in the statistics thus caused is seized upon by superficial observers as evidence of the expansion of German commerce and of the decline of British industries before German competition. It is a curious fact (though I do not wish to lay undue emphasis on it), that the decrease in the imports into Germany from Great Britain, recorded in the following table, is just about balanced by the increase in the imports from British India and Australasia. This further illustrates the diversion of our intermediary trade by the development of German merchant shipping:

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS FROM GERMANY.

Country.	Imports.		Exports.	
British Empire:	1889.	1896.	1889.	1896.
Great Britain.....	£33,361,850	£27,565,650	£32,336,850	£35,639,800
East Indies	4,763,700	8,558,150	1,325,100	2,458,950
Australasia	1,722,900	5,160,200	1,062,750	1,462,350
South Africa.....	681,050	1,055,950	375,950	782,250
West Indies.....	299,550	354,700	82,750	56,400
North America.....	51,400	147,700	817,750	765,100
Russia	26,006,550	31,410,050	8,710,500	11,579,800
Austria Hungary.....	26,492,350	27,342,600	15,950,300	19,984,200
United States.....	15,873,430	26,415,200	19,751,800	19,162,500
France and Algiers...	13,569,950	11,476,750	10,167,350	10,066,550
Belgium	16,786,050	8,660,300	6,859,950	8,396,850
Holland	14,218,000	7,946,800	12,451,300	13,082,000
Switzerland	9,019,300	6,927,550	8,521,450	11,927,300
Italy	7,427,850	6,599,950	5,075,600	4,179,200

In the Annual Financial Review of the *New York Times* of January 1st last, I read:

"The most recent report on trade conditions in Germany was sent to Washington by Vice-Consul-General Hanauer, at Frankfort, in which he gave particular information concerning iron and coal, chemicals and paper and textiles. 'Of late,' he wrote, 'a new phase in Germany's economic life has become apparent, which affects her labor market. Some branches of trade can work only with half power because they lack the raw materials. This refers specially to rolling-mills, which suffer from a dearth of pig-iron; and industries using steel, coal and coke, though fully at work, are not making much profit on their output, as the advance in the cost of the raw materials is not compensated by the prices obtainable for the finished products. Most of the iron—and some machinery—works have contracts that will keep them busy until the middle of next year. These are now working overtime, and refuse to take any more contracts at fixed time and price. The great boom in iron and coal is principally due to the large contracts given out by the Government for its railroad stations and rolling stock, and by municipal and private corporations for narrow-gauge railroads and electric tramways; also, to the many machine works that have sprung up during the last two years.'"

And again:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Loud are the wailings of German manufacturers and exporters of textile fabrics on account of the depressed condition of that branch of trade, which, they claim, is caused by greatly curtailed sales to the United States, and by the growing competition of American textiles in foreign markets. Being crowded out of foreign countries, the German manufacturers overload their home market, which cuts the prices and lessens the profits on domestic sales. * * * Owing to the decline in the exports, the wage scale of textile operatives has of late suffered a reduction, though the cost of living is higher. Therefore, it cannot be said that the standard of life of German laborers, excepting in a few isolated branches of industry, has been raised.

"Through the reports of the Chambers of Commerce and of the trade papers runs, like a red thread, the bitter complaint of the United States tariff, which Germans admit to have boomed American manufactures and fostered America's capacity to compete successfully in the world's markets with the industrial nations of Europe."

The Germans are wrong, however. It is the removal of the tariff that will bother them.

One of the illustrations sought by Mr. Low of the decadence of British industries is the shrinkage of production of iron ore. And he compares the output of the British iron mines in 1870 and in 1895 with those of Germany and the United States. But Germany and the United States had practically no iron smelting to speak of in 1870, and, therefore, had barely tapped their deposits of iron ore. Once they began smelting, it was natural that Germany's output of ore should be quadrupled and America's quintupled in five and twenty years. But the mistake Mr. Low makes is in measuring the decline of the British industry by the decline in the output of British ironstone. That is easily explained. Between 1870 and 1895 we entered upon what may be called the age of steel. The manufacture of steel requires the smelting of hematite ores, the deposits of which in Great Britain are confined to the Cumberland district. To feed the blast furnaces of Scotland and Cleveland, in order to make steel-making iron, we had to import hematite ores from Spain. Germany and the United States are now doing the same thing, neither country having enough native ore presently available for the existing demand of the furnaces. It is perfectly true that the smelting of iron has increased enormously both in Germany and in America, and in America has reached dimensions never yet attained, nor ever likely to be attained, in Great Britain. But it is also true that, up till now, Great Britain is *the only one of the three great iron-producing countries that is able to make both for herself and*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

others. Last year she sent something like 700,000 tons to Germany (direct and by Holland), and even some 36,000 tons to the United States. The fact is that the iron ore problem (of which Mr. Low seems to know nothing), is a matter of as much anxiety in Germany and the United States as in Great Britain. Experienced men in both hemispheres are at a loss to know where all the ore is to be procured to meet the world's demands for iron, if these demands keep on increasing, or even remain as large as they have been for the last two years. Pig iron is raw material. That country which has the best and cheapest supply of ore will naturally produce the most of it, coal being available, but the measure of a nation's industrial activity is in its consumption rather than in its production of crude iron.

Another of the "great staples" in which Mr. Low says Great Britain has lost her position is coal, and he institutes the usual comparison between 1870 and 1895 to show that Britain's proportion of the production of the coal-producing nations had declined from fifty-one to thirty-four per cent. But the fact that other nations have developed their coal resources does not necessarily imply any decline in the commerce of Great Britain. America and Germany could not have made the industrial advance they have made if they had not coal of their own. Yet, even now, Germany does not produce enough coal for her own consumption, and was last year the third largest buyer of British coal, coming closely after France and Italy; and until this year America has not produced more than she consumed. I am free to confess that I expect to see the United States soon as large an exporter of coal as Great Britain, but I do not know that that is a matter for Great Britain to regret. Outside of the coal trade itself, there is a pretty pronounced feeling in Britain that a total stoppage of the export of coal would be an advantage rather than otherwise to her. It is not possible in the space at command to discuss the whole question of coal supplies, but certainly a great deal may be said in favor of the contention that Britain would do better to keep her coal reserve for the future of her own industries than supply it to others to enable them to compete with her industries now. But, however this may be, I have shown elsewhere* that, notwithstanding the development of coal-mining all

*"The Nineteenth Century," July, 1898.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over the world, the British Empire in 1898 still produced thirty-eight per cent. of the world's coal.

There is another serious omission in Mr. Low's method of comparison, and that is the export of new ships built in Great Britain for foreign countries and British colonies. Until last year no record was kept at the Custom House of these transactions, but last year the value of the export of new ships was officially recorded as £9,195,192. Necessarily, this is a variable element; but it must have ranged between £5,000,000 and £10,000,000 per annum for many years past, and is an item for which other countries have had no corresponding entry in their export lists worth taking into account. There is, further, to be reckoned among British exports the large number of old ships sold every year to foreigners, and removed from the British register. No record is kept of the value of such sales, but for an example of the importance of the item, take 1899. In that year, 640,000 tons of old shipping were sold to foreigners, of which 519,000 tons were steamers and 121,000 tons were sailers. At an average of only £7 per ton, that would represent an export of about four and a half millions sterling. And, yet further, there is an item of export of which no record is kept, of which Mr. Low seems unaware, which is yearly increasing in magnitude, and in competition with which any corresponding item of any other country is insignificant. And that is the repair and renewal work done to foreign vessels at British shipyards, engine shops and boiler shops. This is an export of material, as well as of the produce of labor and applied science, which the official statisticians do not recognize. And it amounts to many millions per annum. It is, as I have said, a constantly increasing item, as is also the carrying work done by British vessels for foreign countries. This also is an industrial export. Mr. Low admits that "England still holds her own in shipping," but, surely, an increase from thirty-three per cent. in 1872 to forty-eight per cent. in 1895 of the world's shipping is something more than "holding her own." These are Mr. Low's figures; but the present writer, in an article on "Sea-Power and Sea-Carriage," which he contributed to *The Nineteenth Century* in June, 1899, showed that, taking into consideration the relatively higher carrying power of steamers than of sailers, Great Britain owns fully sixty per cent. of the effective tonnage of the world. That total world's tonnage was increased in 1899

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by about 1,400,000 tons, and fifty-four per cent. of all the new tonnage launched in the world during the year was for British owners. Five years ago it was computed that British-owned vessels earned about £70,000,000 sterling a year in the carriage of the goods of other countries. So great has been the expansion of shipping and sea commerce during the last five years, that one is not disposed to take a lower estimate now than £80,000,000 yearly. This is an item of industrial expansion which has escaped Mr. Low's attention.

There is another reason why a comparison between the foreign trade of Britain in 1870 and that in 1895 does not afford a fair test of progress, relative or positive. The year 1870 was the beginning of a period of high prosperity, which became exuberant and inflated beyond precedent after the conclusion of peace between France and Germany in the following year. The year 1895, on the other hand, was a year of depression, which corresponded more with the commercial conditions of 1869 or 1879 than with those of any one of the early seventies. The general decline in prices between 1870 and 1895 was probably not less than twenty-five per cent., by which proportion, therefore, the 1895 figures ought to be augmented to enable one to judge of the comparative volume of trade. This makes a wonderful difference in the relation of the British total to that of the rest of the world. So also does the bounty on the exports of beet sugar by the beet sugar growing countries. This bounty swells the export lists of the exporting countries at the expense of the taxpayers.

No such comparison as Mr. Low seeks between the trade value of one year with that of another is, or can be, just, without taking into account the changes in the prices of commodities. In the following table I select a number of the leading British exports, to show the great decline in the price of them between the two periods selected by Mr. Low.

	Average prices.	
	1870.	1895.
Alkali, cwt.	7.70s.	4.99s.
Coal, ton.	9.60s.	9.30s.
Cotton yarn, lb.	18.92d.	8.50d.
Cotton piece, yd.	4.75d.	2.86d.
Cotton thread, lb.	39.80d.	31.87d.
Linen yarn, lb.	14.42d.	13.60d.
Jute yarn, lb.	3.72d.	2.46d.
Jute goods, yd.	3.65d.	2.00d.
Pig iron, ton.	59.15s.	47.90s.
Bar iron, ton.	£8.14	£5.90
Cast steel, ton.	£14.25	£13.65
Wool, lb.	15.30d.	9.50d.
Woolen yarn, lb.	33.70d.	21.10d.
Flannels, yd.	17.28d.	7.70d.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A consideration of these figures—and only exigencies of space restrict the length of the list—will materially qualify the figures quoted by Mr. Low of the value of the exports of British products—£199,586,000 in 1870, and £225,890,000 in 1895.

For many years past *The Economist* has rendered valuable service in recasting the value of the imports and exports of each year at the prices of the previous year. As we are concerned just now only with the export trade, I take from *The Economist* of January 27th last the following figures:

BRITISH EXPORTS, AS DECLARED AND AS RE-VALUED.

	1899.	1898.	1897.
Declared value.....	£255,465,455	£233,390,792	£234,350,003
Calculated at prices of the previous year.....	239,613,000	233,899,000	237,054,000
Variation from price.....	+15,851,000	—508,000	—2,704,000
Variation from quantity.....	+ 6,255,000	—321,000	—3,091,000
Actual differences.....	+22,106,215	—828,916	—5,795,548

The value of new ships is deducted from the figures relating to 1899, so as to afford a proper comparison with the previous year. It will be seen that, of the great increase in the value of British exports last year, which was a year of good, of rising, and in some cases of high, prices, nearly one-third is due to the larger quantity exported; that is to say, to expansion of trade. The increase in the total external trade of the United Kingdom, imports, re-exports and British exports, was £41,167,947, of which £13,793,000 was due to increased quantities; and nearly one-half of the increase by quantity was in the exports of British products, such as Mr. Low distinguishes as "special" exports. It is to be remembered that this increase has been gained at a time of unprecedented activity in every one of the great industrial countries—America, Germany, France, Belgium—and of new industrial developments in Russia, India, Japan, and (to some extent) China. Now, if we take the figure on which Mr. Low dwells with so much foreboding, £225,890,000, the declared value of the exports of 1895, we do not need to take the trouble of re-valuation, because prices were, if anything, more in Mr. Low's favor in 1894; that is to say, re-valuation on the rates of 1894 would tend to reduce the 1895 total. And comparing 1895 with 1899, we find an increase in British exports of £29,575,455, of which at least £12,000,000 is due to increased quantities. May Britons be forgiven

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if they fail to find any evidence of decline there, however much other countries have increased?

They must also be excused from being depressed by Mr. Low's parade of percentages. It is a method of comparative statistics that may be made very sensational, but is very misleading. Thus, it is disturbing only to superficial observers to read that the exports of Russia increased 17.35 per cent. in the twenty-five years, whilst those of Great Britain increased only 13.17 per cent. But the volume of increase was only £9,890,000 in the one case, and it was £26,304,000 in the other. Again, it is startling to learn that, between 1870 and 1895, the exports of the United States increased 110.66 per cent; but the total in 1895 was £34,000,000 less than Britain's total in 1870, and £60,600,000 less than Britain's total in 1895. If a small manufacturer making, say, £2,000 of profit yearly, raises his profits one year by £1,000, he has increased his trade fifty per cent. But if his neighbor, making £20,000 yearly, at the same time raises his profits to £22,000, by an increase of ten per cent. in his much larger trade, I don't think the bigger man would consider himself on the down grade, nor justified in feeling nervous or jealous at the growing trade of the smaller man.

It is perfectly true that "the majority of Englishmen have not yet realized that England is fast being outstripped in the commercial race," though many of them are quite familiar with the Swedish statistics that seem so convincing to Mr. Low. They are well accustomed to being told so, even by their own callow, yet zealous Consular Agents, who think it their duty, in reporting to their official superiors on the state of commerce in their respective districts, to lecture the astutest traders and the most experienced manufacturers in the world on how to manage their own businesses. We all know the pig-headed, stupidly conservative British trader evolved out of the inner consciousness of the Consular clerk, but I do not think our American or German competitors abroad know him. And I have seen very creditable copies of him in German and American dress in German and American consular reports. The fact is that the British trader has been too much accustomed for centuries to rely on his own individual enterprise, foresight and sagacity to have much faith in the Consular Agent as a national commercial traveler. Consuls are, of course, very necessary and useful officials in their own line; but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"they don't know everything down in Judee," and the wheels within wheels of trade cannot be followed by one not in trade. The Consul can only report what he is told, and he is told only what it suits somebody to tell him. I have extracted one or two examples from American and German official papers that may not be without instruction in this connection.

In 1896 a German Export Commission was sent out to study the markets of China, Korea and Japan. It brought home a vast collection of samples and a good deal of useful information, of which German manufacturers have been since endeavoring to make the utmost. With regard to this mission, the United States Consul-General at Frankfort thus wrote:

"There is in all the specialized work of these commissions a broad recognition of the fact that, in foreign trade, it is the buyer, not the seller, who determines the kind of article he wants and the form in which he wants it turned out, labelled and packed for shipment to him. It is the business of the seller not to force upon the consumer something that he never heard of and does not want, but to ascertain exactly what he has used and sold hitherto, and then to furnish him with something of the same general kind—but better for his money—that he has had before. The exporter who succeeds best is, other things being equal, he who learns most accurately the wants of his customers and supplies them most nearly in the currency and on the terms and conditions to which the buyer is accustomed. At present, the Germans are perhaps the ablest masters of this theory of export trade; the English are thought to have lost much for want of it, and Americans will undoubtedly excel in it when once they realize its importance."

As against this I will place the testimony of the correspondent of a British trade journal, *The Machinery Market*—in the Mediterranean:

"It is curious to note that the United States manufacturers (of hardware and machinery) are fast gaining ground in the Levant, at the expense of the German industry. It may be assumed that, in the course of time, in the hardware and machinery trade, Great Britain and the U. S. A.—in other words the Anglo-Saxon race—will 'eat up' the Teuton race, in this and many more lines; this, notwithstanding the fact that the German Consular Service is the very best in the world—a praise to which it is eminently entitled—while on the other hand our British Consular Service leaves much to desire, and to deplore."

The following was written by the United States Consul-General at Frankfort for the benefit of American traders:

"Salesmen who frequently come to Germany with no knowledge of any language but English are seriously handicapped, and this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disadvantage is still further increased when the traveller puts himself into the attitude of a peddler, by attempting to sell goods of wholly different classes and character, as, for instance, shoes, machinery, belting, lumber and bicycles. No man willing to accept the hard life of a commercial traveller is likely to understand fully all these diverse branches of trade, and his efforts to sell something concerning which he is ignorant are generally and deservedly abortive. Export syndicates have their distinct, and often very important, uses; but their best results are accomplished when they represent most fully different products in one special line or department of trade."

The point in this testimony is that it is not only British consuls who are dissatisfied with the tradecraft of their fellow-countrymen.

I do not know of the "antagonism to a new thing," which, Mr. Low says, throws us five and twenty years behind America. He instances the Underground Railway. But the Underground Railway was made many years before the Overhead Railway, and before electricity was applied to locomotion. We do not love the Underground Railway, but we prefer it to the Overhead Railway, just as we prefer to take our luggage with us when traveling to have it delivered to us hours after we want it. Electric lighting has been adopted less rapidly in Great Britain than elsewhere simply because coal and gas have been cheaper there than anywhere else. So, likewise, the streets of our old towns and cities are not so well adapted to tramway services as are the streets of most new American towns. We have not pulled down and rebuilt our towns in order to make room for street cars, but we can provide a cheaper service than America, where, I believe, a half penny fare is unknown. The labor-saving devices in office and factory that Mr. Low thinks peculiar to America are perfectly familiar in Britain. The head of a great establishment in England or Scotland does just as Mr. Low represents the American boss as doing, with his electric buttons and desk telephones and all the rest.

I don't know the Englishman, whom Mr. Low describes, who, "if he wants his cashier, rings a hand bell, which is answered by a boy, to whom the message is given, and in course of time the cashier appears," though I fancy I have heard of the American who, "before the Englishman can tell the cashier to make out the check, has cashed his check at the bank, invested the proceeds and made a profit." Is he not the boss of the famous establishment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where they saved half a million dollars per annum in ink alone by not crossing their t's and dotting their i's—before, of course, the evolution of the typewriter? The Englishman, I know, would have had his investment made long before he drew his check, which he would only draw to close, not to open, the transaction.

What British trade suffers most from is neither national conservatism, nor John Bullish obstinacy, nor the natural development of America and Germany, nor the stupidity of the British "boss," nor afternoon tea, but Trade Unionism. This it is that cripples us, by enhancing the costs of production and constantly restricting the output. Mr. Low doubts whether the tyranny of the British Trade Union is any more oppressive than that known in America. But he does not know British Trade Unionism, of which I could tell him moving tales enough to "make his flesh creep." "Why does not the United States suffer from the same cause?" asks Mr. Low. Have patience. The turn of both the United States and Germany will come—will not now be long in coming.

But while Britons neither believe themselves to be the congenital idiots they are depicted by some of their own officials, nor can find in their own conditions, in the industrial activity and social prosperity of the country, any evidence of that dry rot and decline which Mr. Ernest Williams and Mr. Maurice Low think they have discovered, it is quite a mistake to suppose they are filled with a consuming desire to monopolize the trade of the world. They are not in the least alarmed at American competition, for instance. They know that in time it will take the gilt off a good deal of their gingerbread, but they know by experience that, as the world develops, new industries grow. Some may pass from Britain to America, but others will succeed. Change is not necessarily decay. And I wish Americans could understand that the industrial development of the United States is not regarded with jealousy and envy by Great Britain, but rather with the quiet pride with which a man watches the progress in life of his own son. It is an old saying that "there is no friendship in business." Whether this be true or not, there is certainly no need for enmity. The more prosperous America becomes, the better will it be for us and the rest of the world, though the conditions may undergo change.

BENJAMIN TAYLOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CATHOLIC CITIZENS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

BY THE REV. THOMAS H. MALONE, MEMBER OF THE COLORADO STATE BOARD OF CHARITIES AND CORRECTIONS.

THE article by the Right Reverend James McFaul, Bishop of Trenton, entitled "Catholics and American Citizenship," in the September number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, is, in my judgment, unfortunate in the time of its publication. Even if the grievances of which the Bishop of Trenton complains had existence in fact, they would be less likely to receive due attention during the excitement of a Presidential canvass than at a period when men's minds would be more prone to fair and conservative judgment on the question under discussion. At such a time as the present the publication of the contention that Catholics are denied their rights under the Constitution, and that they should, therefore, band together for action, is likely to react upon Catholics everywhere.

But have the grievances of which the Bishop of Trenton complains any real existence? Are the Catholic inmates of State institutions denied their guaranteed rights? This is, indeed, a serious question, not to be lightly or carelessly answered.

It is to be regretted that Bishop McFaul thought it necessary to make such an elaborate exposition of Catholic loyalty; and yet it must be remembered that, if Catholics over-emphasize their loyalty, if they continually call attention to it, and cannot let it be taken for granted, as other Americans do, the blame belongs to the fanatics who, with their fantasies and their miserable distrust of human nature, have put Catholics in this anomalous position. So ruthless and malign has been the misrepresentation in certain quarters of the spirit of Catholic citizens that it is natural for Catholics, when opportunity offers, to declare their love of coun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try, and to show that their faith does not make them, and has never made them, traitors. When a man is called coward, he may be excused if he points immediately, in disproof of the charge, to his acts of bravery; if he is called a thief, he tries to prove his honesty; if he is accused of being a traitor, he attempts to prove his loyalty. All this is natural, and perhaps fault should not be found with it. But the time has come when Catholics can well afford to cease declarations of loyalty; and that is equivalent to saying that it is time for those who charge disloyalty against them to cease their groundless attacks.

Much to be deplored, however, is Bishop McFaul's sweeping indictment of all the American people—for such in effect his article is—for having, as he alleges, uniformly and generally denied to Catholic citizens their Constitutional privileges. And, indeed, even if there were adequate foundation for all of the charges made by the Bishop of Trenton, the remedy which he suggests, or which may be fairly inferred from his utterances, namely, political unity among Catholics, is pernicious in itself, and must, according to the law of human acts, prove injurious to the Catholic people.

Catholics owe it to themselves to avoid giving, by their attitude or their acts, even the semblance of probability to the statements of those who, when talking about them, argue from the view point of the Middle Ages, and picture Catholics doing now what Catholics did then. Enlightened non-Catholics realize full well that non-Catholics in the Middle Ages did many things which their co-religionists would not do now, and appreciate clearly that Catholics have not been left out in the grand march of progress, which has brought with it new ideas, new interests and new ways of looking at things.

In the Middle Ages and the period of the Reformation politics and religion were almost one. To-day men, whether Catholic or Protestant, separate their politics and religion. That is, they separate the tenets of dogma from the practices of politics, and bring to their politics only the morality taught by religion.

Bishop McFaul's article certainly breathes a spirit hostile to this modern practice, and his recommendations could scarcely claim justification even on the ground that the disabilities which he alleges Catholics suffer, have undeniable existence. Even on such an extreme supposition, it is questionable if political unity,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

having religion as its basic principle, would not accentuate, rather than ameliorate, the disagreeable conditions.

The following, in brief, is the statement of Bishop McFaul's position:

(1.) Are Catholics in the United States permitted to enjoy their Constitutional rights in their integrity? Are they allowed the free exercise of their religion? Does the flag guarantee and protect them in the rights which are enjoyed by all other citizens? Are there any grievances of which, as American citizens, we, as Catholics, have reason to complain?

(2.) We ask that the priest be allowed to preach Catholic doctrine to Catholic adults, and to teach Catholic children the catechism; to offer mass, so that Catholics may be present at it; to administer the sacraments; and we demand that Catholics shall not be compelled to listen to non-Catholic teaching, nor to participate in any worship except their own. In a word, we claim for Catholic clergymen the right to enter our State institutions, at seasonable times, to give the benefits of the Catholic religion to Catholics, and we require that the system of worship and of religious teaching at present existing in many institutions—a system which leads to proselytism—shall be abolished. The Constitutions of the United States and of the several States guarantee the rights of conscience to the inmates of public institutions. Why, then, are Catholics obliged to be present at non-Catholic prayers and instructions? Why should clergymen be subjected to annoyance and often harshness, when bringing to the Catholic inmates the consolations of religion? It is true, we have succeeded in gaining a portion of our rights in some institutions. But this has been the result of a long and arduous struggle against injustice.

From the manner of this statement, one would infer that the privileges asked by the Bishop of Trenton are, in most instances, refused to Roman Catholics.

For some years I have been an active member of the Board of Charities and Corrections of Colorado; I have represented that State at charitable conventions, prison congresses, etc., in Europe and America, and, consequently, feel that I can speak with some degree of authority on the questions raised by the Bishop of Trenton.

To his first question there can be but one answer. In America,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than in any country in the world, Catholics are permitted to enjoy, without interference or molestation, their full Constitutional rights, while they are guaranteed the freest exercise of their religion in every State in the Union.

This is true, likewise, in our new possessions, and particularly so in the Philippines, where, were it not for the protection of the American flag, our co-religionists would be hunted to the death by those whose Shibboleth is: "Death to the Friars."

Now, as to the allegation that Catholics are denied their spiritual privileges in penal institutions, an intimate knowledge of the facts forces me to a directly opposite conclusion to that expressed by the Bishop of Trenton.

That, in some isolated case, a priest may have been hampered as to his spiritual ministrations by an excess of official machinery, or even by a bigoted official, I do not deny. But a particular instance of this character can not, in logic or in common sense, be adduced in support of the universal conclusion that Catholics are prevented from receiving spiritual ministrations in charitable, penal, and reformatory institutions. To do so would be as unjust as to assume that Catholic ecclesiastical authority is unwilling to supply the religious needs of these institutions, because, in a certain case, a State Board of Charities and Corrections has been unable to secure the ministrations of a Catholic clergyman in the institutions under its control, notwithstanding repeated and urgent requests to Episcopal authority to make provision therefor.

It has been my privilege, as well as pleasure, to visit State institutions, such as homes for dependent children, prisons, asylums, hospitals, etc., in all parts of the United States. I have been received everywhere with the most gracious good will, courtesy, and kindness. And, if I so desired, at all seasonable times, I could have celebrated mass, and given religious instruction to the Catholic inmates. I am speaking of the present, and not of the past; for it is better to let the dead past bury its dead.

I am fully aware that conditions, due to antagonistic causes, have been different in past generations. At the present time, however, the best of our citizens—those who have helped to make this country what it is, and will continue to assist in her progress on broad humanitarian lines—have no fear of the Catholic element of our citizenship, which has been with us since the beginning, and has thrown itself nobly into the common struggle.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These people know that we are all "brothers under the skin," and that, whatever has happened in past ages, both sides were to blame, and both have learned the lesson of tolerance, liberality and nationality; and it is not for us to throw into each others' faces the blood they then spilled, and which has long since cried to Heaven for vengeance.

The condition against which the Bishop of Trenton declaims does not, except in rare instances, exist in the United States.

For many years priests have been welcome to visit institutions in the State of New York; so, in well-nigh universal degree, has it been elsewhere.

The general statement that Catholic priests are free to minister, without let or hindrance, to the Catholic inmates of city, county, State and federal institutions is so nearly capable of universal verification, that it stands as a truism. The rare cases to the contrary—including, I believe, some instances of friction in New Jersey—are quite outside general conditions.

Regarding the treatment of Catholic Indian schools, the Bishop of Trenton quotes the following from a letter signed by Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishops Ryan and Kain:

> "Despite the fact that Religious Orders and other Catholic bodies have equipped schools for the education of the Indian children, in full confidence that the Government would not reverse its recognized and successful policy of subsidizing these schools—yet in the height of their success and in spite of their doing the work cheaper and better than the Government itself could do it, we find that the subsidy has beeen for the greater part and will eventually be entirely withdrawn, and that these well founded works of Catholic benevolence, begun in good faith, and with great expenditure of time and money, are to be abandoned to their fate."

All good Catholics, of course, deplore the fact that our Catholic Indian schools have been hampered, if the failure of the Government to make further appropriations for their support has so resulted.

But it is difficult to understand how any one could find reason to conclude that the Government "would not reverse its recognized and successful policy of subsidizing these schools."

Five years ago, under Mr. Cleveland's administration, this Government declared it to be its definite and irrevocable policy in the future to refuse support to private Indian schools; and of this intention five years' notice was given—the support being

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

withdrawn at the rate of twenty per cent. annually. We, of course, regret that the Government so concluded; but, in view of persistent misrepresentations that the Catholic Church is a politico-religious institution, it will not prove an unmixed evil. As long as Catholics are not discriminated against in this matter, we certainly have little cause of complaint.

I quite agree with a most distinguished Catholic author that it would be much better if both Catholics and Protestants would cease accepting money from the State for any purpose. It is a habit not calculated to strengthen the religion that makes a practice of leaning on the State for support.

Bishop McFaul touches upon other matters of importance to Catholics, but these are not due to bigotry on the part of any one in particular, but rather to a misunderstanding of Catholic needs. I am satisfied that, if Bishop McFaul had followed his own advice and gone to Washington, with an explanation of the mistakes which may have occurred in Cuba, Porto Rico, or elsewhere, in dealing with Catholic affairs, the grievances which he narrates would have been adjusted to his satisfaction. But if an Administration, Democratic or Republican, be led to believe, by high authority, that Catholics are satisfied with the treatment accorded them, it is obvious that the blame, if it should be attached anywhere, should at least be divided.

All will accept, in the very spirit in which it was given, Bishop McFaul's assurance that he had no intention of "promoting or even suggesting, a Catholic Political Party." But it is the result of his efforts that must, in the last analysis, be the norm of criticism. And that his articles have been so framed as fairly to subject them to the charge of suggesting political unity along religious lines, is obvious from the criticisms they have evoked in different parts of the country. THOMAS H. MALONE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PICTURE GALLERY OF THE HERMITAGE.—IV.*

BY CLAUDE PHILLIPS.

To attempt any account of the Dutch "Small Masters," that is, of the famous *genre* painters of the seventeenth century, within such limits as those which here impose themselves, is to be reduced to despair. The Hermitage collection, crowded together on screens and walls in a single large gallery, is limitless in extent, and ends by exhausting even the most passionate lover of Dutch seventeenth-century art. Unrivalled in its groups of certain special masters, it is by no means always up to the same high level, and cannot in a good many instances be said to include "the pick of the basket." The same fastidious taste has not in all cases presided at the selection of the pictures in this section, which, for instance, makes the Berlin Gallery so enjoyable in this important branch, and gives charm to such exceptional groups of Dutch masters as those in the Royal Collection at Buckingham Palace and in the Wallace collection. Leaving out of consideration the Ryks-Museum of Amsterdam, Van der Helst is nowhere as magnificently represented as he is here in the Hermitage. Works wholly exceptional in his *œuvre* are the great piece known as "La Présentation de la Fiancée," and the two less vast but still very important "Family Portraits," while a much less usual picture, "The New Market of Amsterdam," is authenticated by his signature and the date 1666. Absolutely unique and beyond rivalry by any other museum or collection is the group of paintings by Paul Potter. From the Malmaison comes the "Farm Scene"—often named as the masterpiece of the too short-lived animal-painter, and certainly one of his very finest things, although it cannot be said to surpass in quality the "Farm Scene at Sunset" in the Duke of Westminster's collection

*The publication of the concluding instalment of Mr. Claude Phillips's singularly interesting contribution has been unavoidably postponed, in consequence of the large amount of space required from month to month for the discussion of subjects of great and immediate concern.—Ed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at Grosvenor House. Then we have, also from the Malmaison, the curious panel in fourteen separate compartments, "The Life of the Sportsman." In some of these there is deliberate and humorous imitation of the style and motives of certain contemporaries among the Netherlanders. The compartment with "Diana and Actæon" is actually by Cornelis Poelenburg, from which circumstance some critics have too rashly concluded that the curious composite painting remained unfinished at Potter's death. A rarity again is "The Wolf Hound," of quite life-size, and bearing the signature of the master. The group of three De Hoochs is interesting, though it cannot compare for a moment with those in the Ryks-Museum of Amsterdam, the National Gallery, the Wallace collection, and Buckingham Palace. Three distinct stages in the practice of the great *luministe* are here represented. Van der Meer of Delft, his only rival in the treatment of indoor light—his superior, perhaps, in the estimation of the modern connoisseur—is not represented at the Hermitage. His fame is of modern creation; when the Imperial collection was in the process of formation, his name had been well-nigh forgotten, and his works were distributed among other masters. One of the most interesting things in this section is a *genre* scene with a woman seated in the raised embrasure of a window, and seen in the act of spinning. A luminous background to her figure is provided by the large and unusually ornate window of stained glass. The picture, without any such close imitation as suggests the intention to deceive, recalls Pieter de Hooch, whose name must, all the same, be put aside. Those of Esaias Boursse and of Isaac Koedyck have been most frequently put forward in connection with this charming, if rather disconcerting, work. The former painter, who is often confounded with Vermeer of Delft, is best known by the signed picture in the Wallace collection, which is much colder in tone than the St. Petersburg example. The latter has, however, distinct points of contact with the "Woman Spinning" ascribed to Boursse in the Ryks-Museum at Amsterdam. All the same, the canvas which comes nearest in style to the Hermitage piece is Koedyck's "Interior" in the Antwerp Gallery. Hobbemas are scarce in all public and private collections except those of the United Kingdom, and the Director of the Hermitage, though he has long been striving to secure a fine specimen of the much-prized landscapist, can as yet catalogue

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

none among his treasures. Jacob van Ruysdael is, on the other hand, represented by no less than twelve canvases, three or four of which may take rank with his most exquisite things. Then we have thirteen works by Gerard Dou, six by Frans van Mieris, a good number also by the tiresome and mechanical Willem van Mieris, five Metsus, ten Jan Steens, six Terboechs, only one Adrian Van de Velde, one Jan van de Capelle, two seapieces by Willem Van de Velde, no less than nine examples of that hard colorist but subtle observer, Karel du Jardin. Of his contemporary, and, perhaps, master, the prolific Claes Picterz Berchem, the Imperial Gallery possesses no less than sixteen, or taking into account one doubtful piece, seventeen specimens. The art of Jan Van Heyden, so exquisitely minute, yet so broad and luminous in effect, is in hardly any other gallery as finely illustrated as in that of the Russian Crown, which includes nine of his works, the greater number of which come from the Crozat and Malmaison collections.

The paintings of the Spanish school, to the exhibition of which one of the three vastest and most splendid galleries of the palatial museum is entirely devoted, is remarkably complete, rather than remarkably splendid. As regards the works of Velazquez, it stands far behind Vienna and the National Gallery. As regards the other seventeenth-century painters of the schools, its display compares on at least equal terms with that made by the Royal Gallery of Buda-Pesth, formerly the Esterhazy Gallery; no other European collection out of Spain being on equal terms with the two last-mentioned in this respect. By Morales there is, among other things, a "Mater Dolorosa," to an unusual degree moving and even great in the expression of passionate grief. For once this most unequal and most fantastic in exaggeration of Spanish sixteenth-century painters almost deserves his epithet of *El Divino*. A masterpiece in the class to which it belongs is the three-quarter length "Margaret, Duchess of Parma," by Alonso Sanchez Coello. A rare intensity of life, a dignity sovereign in its quietude, mark this singularly remarkable portrait, which one hesitates a little to leave to the very interesting, yet rather dry, Spaniard, who became the successful rival of portraiture of his master, Antonio Moro. It is noticeable that we have here already the inclined plane of which later on Velazquez will make so excessive a use. The Hispaniolized Vincencio Carducho—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

really the Florentine Vincente Carducci—shows himself nevertheless in the "Ecstacy of St. Anthony of Padua," one of the most markedly Spanish in character of those Italianizing masters who were so many during the early seventeenth century. His sweetness pushed to excess and the quasi-feminine charm of his style make of him a precursor of Murillo. These peculiar qualities are, however, even better seen in the great altarpiece, "The Virgin in Glory," of the Buda-Pesth Gallery than here. Out of the tolerably numerous canvases ascribed at the Hermitage to Velasquez only two can be accepted as genuine. One is the tremendously forceful and life-like "Innocent X.," a bust-portrait from the Walpole collection, identical, so far as it goes, with the surprising likeness of the Panfili pope which in itself gives fame to the Doria Palace at Rome. The writer persists, notwithstanding the arguments of Herr Carl Justi and M. de Somof, in holding this to be not a repetition but a preliminary study from life for the Doria picture. The technique comes nearer to that of the original than does the handling of the exquisitely subtle "Innocent X." at Apsley House, though the latter must count also as an original Velasquez. It resembles more closely still the working of the brush in the nearly identical bust-portraits of the master's enfranchised slave Pareja, which are to be found at Castle Howard and Longford Castle, respectively. The only other original Velasquez is one which hangs in the gallery, but has not as yet found its way into the catalogue. This one of those early *bodegones* or kitchen-pieces, of which the typical examples are the *Aguador* in the Duke of Wellington's collection at Apsley House and an "Old Woman Cooking Eggs" in that of Sir Francis Cook at Richmond. In the St. Petersburg piece two old men and a boy are seen at table.

The facile and charming art of Murillo is represented—disregarding doubtful pictures—by twenty examples of varying merit, but some of them of first-rate quality. It is too much the fashion, now that the sovereign mastery of Velasquez is everywhere recognized, to "run down" the facile and brilliant Sevillian, who once was borne on the very crest of the wave as regards popularity, but has now momentarily descended into the trough of the waters. Those who think it "modern" to assume an altogether contemptuous attitude with regard to an artist, superficial no doubt, yet in his way of extraordinary accomplishment, a little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forget his wonderful variety, his unerring if excessive elegance in composition, the true naïveté, the sympathetic quality, of his realism when he allows himself to face Nature at close quarters. His passion in sacred art is by no means merely false or self-conscious; it is the outcome of a quasi-feminine devotion, perfectly true as far as it goes, yet strongly contrasting with the virility of a Ribera and the austere passion of a Zurbaran.

The "Assumption of the Virgin"—one of the finest pictures of its class—is a composition superb in rhythm, and a painting which in handling shows that *vaporoso* quality so much admired by the artist's worshippers of a past time. Broader and more masculine in execution is the "Immaculate Conception." The "Vision of St. Anthony of Padua," which contains the first idea for the great picture at Seville, is beautified by a naïve and quite feminine tenderness not easily to be resisted, save by those who have deliberately steeled themselves against the ingenious charm of the painter. Two vast and masterly canvases from the celebrated sequence entitled "The History of Jacob," are "Jacob's Dream" and "Isaac Blessing Jacob." In the former the figures of the angels mounting and descending the ladder are drawn and composed with extraordinary skill. Another canvas belonging to the same series is the "Meeting of Jacob and Laban," in the collection of the Duke of Westminster at Grosvenor House. But the most moving, the most typically Spanish work in the whole gallery is the "St. Lawrence" of Zurbaran—a masterpiece of the painter, not less as a painting than as an expression of all-conquering faith. With a certain self-consciousness, with a certain sombre distrust of self belonging to the art which follows upon the Catholic Revival, the Spaniards of the seventeenth century, unlike the contemporary Italians, preserved in their conception of sacred subjects a freshness, a naïveté, an ardor, which were at that advanced period not to be paralleled by a corresponding mood in any other people. The more strange that their greatest glory, Velasquez, should have been so entirely without this inestimable power of embodying the true sacred passion! St. Lawrence, as he is imagined by Zurbaran, stands before the beholder in splendid vestments, holding the emblem of his cruel martyrdom. He is all human in his steadfastness and strength, but with a humanity touched already with the divine. His upturned gaze knows nothing of the spectator, his whole soul is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poured out in love and prayer. No taint of delight in self-torture, no merely hysterical passion, mars this wonderful effort.

Even more complete and remarkable than the collection of Spanish masters is that of the French painters of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Of this the nucleus only is to be found in the Hermitage itself, the Imperial palaces in and near St. Petersburg furnishing a large proportion of fine pictures and filling up many gaps in the extended series contained in the museum itself. It would be a great advantage if some of the mediocre originals, and the flagrant copies which represent the Bolognese school were separated from the really fine things of the same class, and then promptly relegated to the half-lighted galleries which now nominally show but do not truly display the finest canvases of the French schools. The Louvre itself hardly contains more Poussons than the Hermitage, yet on the present occasion it is, alas, not possible to go beyond the mere notation of this fact. Charles Le Brun, the incarnation of the Louis-Quatorze style, not less in monumental decoration than in painting, is here, as is also Eustache Le Lueur. Pierre Mignard, Le Brun's acrimonious rival, may be studied in three of his most important canvases, "La Mort de Cleopâtre," "Le Retour de Jephté" (Private Apartments), and "La Magnanimité d'Alexandre le Grand." Again, Jean-François de Troy is to be seen in some of his most ambitious and elaborate efforts, including two separate versions of "Susanne au Bain," and a large "Loth et ses filles." But we are advancing too far in point of time, and forgetting one of the great glories of the Hermitage, the celebrated series of landscapes by Claude le Lorrain, which from Cassel and La Malmaison found their way into the Hermitage. These are "Le Matin," "Le Midi," "Le Soir," and "La Nuit." It is unfortunately very difficult, in the badly lighted gallery in which they are placed, to appreciate at their true worth either these or the other Claudes included in the collection.

Watteau, the most enchanting poet-painter of an age which—in France at least—was mainly one of bright, elastic and elegant prose, is well represented, though not with anything like the completeness with which his art is illustrated in the royal and public collections of Berlin and Potsdam, and in the Wallace collection. Here are two of the most famous among the quite early works, the "Fatigues de la Guerre" and "Délassements de la

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Guerre," both of them from the collection of Crozat, Baron de Thiers. Much finer and better preserved than either of these, in the same early style, is the military scene engraved in the great *Recueil de Julienne* as "Le Camp Volant," and described in the Goncourts' Catalogue Raisonné, as "d'après le tableau que Watteau avait fait pour le sieur Sirois peu après sa seconde arrivée de Flandres." This picture the writer had the good fortune to see and recognize in one of the private corridors of the Hermitage under the name of Pater. The name of Watteau's same pupil and fellow-townsman is attached to a little piece in the Serge Stroganoff collection, which from a too cursory examination appeared to the writer to be also an early Watteau, and perhaps the picture engraved by C. Cochin as the "Détachement faisant Halte." Strangely enough there *are* two exquisite little Paters in the Imperial collection, and these are not catalogued as such, but bear a false name, so obscure that the writer has omitted to note it. The quaint "Savoyard avec sa Marmotte" has been rendered popular by the engraving of B. Audran. The exquisite painter of *Fêtes Galantes* is at his finest in the fantastic and delightful "Mezzetin," in which is presented a nocturnal serenade by this amorous personage of the Comédie Italienne. The sovereign charm by which the Valenciennes master is able to gild with the rays of true poetry the conventional scenes and figures of the busy Italian comedy—thus endowing them with a new and ideal existence—is here very strongly felt. By Lancret, too, there are some charming things, including "Le Concert," "Les Jeunes Oiseleurs," and "Femme au Bain." But the most charming (now or lately to be found in the Private Apartments) is assuredly the "Portrait de Mademoiselle Camargo," an original repetition of the celebrated picture in the Wallace collection. There the captivating dancer poses in a ballet costume of white and blue; in the Hermitage example she is in a similarly fashioned dress, carried out, however, in brownish yellow and rose-pink. One Boucher only, the very curious "Repos en Egypte," dated 1757, shows the hand of the Pompadour's court painter, whom we are accustomed to associate with scenes of a very different order. Chardin is present with repetitions of "Le Bénédicité" and "La Blanchisseuse," Fragonard with a broadly brushed "Intérieur d'une Maison de Paysan," his sister-in-law, Marguerite Gérard, with two paintings in that style of finish—borrowed from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

least attractive and least characteristic phase of Fragonard's art —which the French style *léché*. Greuze appears with a "Tête de jeune Fille," two portraits, and one of those falsely and repellantly sentimental subjects, so characteristic of the man and the moment, entitled "La Mort du Paralytique."* No less than seventeen "Ports de Mer," "Paysages," and "Tempêtes" represent the art—at its best, delicate in tone and accomplished in execution—of Claude-Joseph Vernet.

The English school is illustrated at the Hermitage by seven pictures only; yet, even thus it is more highly honored than in most of the public galleries of the Continent. The "Portrait of Oliver Cromwell," by Robert Walker, is a sketch for a larger picture. The "Portrait of Abraham van der Doort," by Van Dyck's pupil, Dobson, is especially interesting as presenting the industrious artist who was the custodian of Charles the First's artistic treasures, and left behind him a catalogue of them which, notwithstanding its imperfections, is of inestimable value. By Sir Godfrey Kneller are the portraits of two Englishmen of renown, the philosopher, John Locke, and the sculptor and wood-carver, Grinling Gibbons. Sir Joshua Reynolds cannot be said to show at his best in this gallery, where his canvases hang dangerously near to the unrivalled series of Rembrandts. The three pictures for which he is responsible are all of them of some celebrity, yet of the richness, the variety, the fascination of his art they give little or no idea. That vast canvas, "The Infant Hercules Strangling the Serpent," was a commission from Catherine II., "Empress and Autocratrix of all the Russias," and she paid for her "high art" in true imperial fashion with the sum of fifteen hundred guineas, the biggest price ever obtained by Reynolds for a picture. Most graciously, too, she added to the agreed sum a gold box with her cipher in diamonds. It must be owned that in such empty and inflated attempts at great art as these canvases in the Hermitage, Reynolds and his followers were absolutely unsatisfactory, infinitely inferior, indeed, to the contemporary French painters, who even in their most frigidly academic performances proved that they had built upon a solid basis of precept and example. The Englishmen, so superior to their French brothers in art in many of the qualities which go to make up the

* The Imperial Academy of Arts at St. Petersburg preserves a vast collection of drawings and studies by Greuze.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great painter, here never found their feet. Less worthy still of the artist than the elaborate picture which was produced in response to Catherine's liberality is "The Continence of Scipio." The "Snake in the Grass" or "Cupid Detaching the Girdle of Venus," is one of three versions of the subject, and not the best of them. Another is in the National Gallery, and a third, the most brilliant in color of the three, in the collection of Lord Burton at Chesterfield House.

A survey of the paintings by old masters in the Russian capital would not be complete without some account of the private collections, which cannot, nevertheless, be so much as attempted on the present occasion. The gallery of Count Serge Stroganoff in the Newski Prospect containing authentic examples of Gentile da Fabriano, Botticelli, and Filippino Lippi, a magnificent "Head of a Youth" by Boltraffio, under the name of Leonardo da Vinci, two superb Rembrandts, and two exceedingly fine pendant portraits dating from the early time of Van Dyck, which have already been mentioned in the course of these remarks. The sumptuous Youssoupoff Palace holds, with many late Italian and many French paintings of great value, a most interesting "Portrait of a Lady," belonging to the earlier time of Lorenzo Lotto, in which the sitter, though she is much more decently attired, bears a very striking resemblance to the "Fornarina" of the Barberini Palace at Rome. Its two magnificent and altogether exceptional Rembrandts of the very late time were among the greatest examples of the master to be seen in the Amsterdam Exhibition of 1898. The collection of Count Davidoff gains celebrity from a majestic name and false signature of Giovanni Bellini displays also an ad- and touching "Christ" by the same master-hand, and under the mirable "St. Jerome" by Cima da Conegliano, which may compare on equal terms with the representations of the same subject contained in the National Gallery and the Brera of Milan. Lastly, the house of M. Semenoff—a recognized authority on Netherlandish art—is filled from floor to roof with examples of the lesser Dutch masters, among which are to be found many things of interest to the connoisseur and the specialist.

CLAUDE PHILLIPS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED